



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BT
836
.P76

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY



From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY



E. W. Whitney

Gift of J. Vinton.
THE
COMPLETE DISCUSSION

OF THE QUESTION OF

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT,

BETWEEN

D. A. PROUTY, AFFIRMATIVE,

AND

D. S. FOSTER, NEGATIVE.

PRINTED BY SARGENT.

FROM OF
THE DOCUMENT MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
GREENWICH, N. Y.

UNIVERSITY
CRAYNE
TUMING
MEDICAL
SEARY

THE
CORRESPONDENCE AND DISCUSSION
OF THE
QUESTION OF ENDLESS MISERY

BETWEEN
MISS L. A. PROUTY, ORTHODOX,
IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, AND
E. S. FOSTER, UNIVERSALIST,
IN THE NEGATIVE.

Chester, Vt., 1869.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

PRINTED BY
THE CLAREMONT MANUFACTURING COMPANY.
1870.

BT
836
P 76

NOTE TO THE READER.

There are several important reasons why this publication of the Discussion between Miss L. A. Prouty, in the affirmative, and E. S. Foster, in the negative, is requested.

First. Because the book which Miss Prouty has published, grossly misrepresents almost every thing connected with the Debate.

Second. Because the community demand justice, and desire to know the great efforts, under the name of Miss L. A. Prouty, which have been combined for the special purpose of fastening obloquy on Rev. E. S. Foster.

Third. Because it is a duty to correct misrepresentation, to expose error, to bring each party to justice, and vindicate truth.

THE FIRST LETTER OF MISS PROUTY.

CHESTER, May —, 1869.

The *first letter* (inclosing the articles of agreement written by you) was addressed to Mrs. H—— W—— advising how to open a discussion with Mr. Foster, in connection with the articles of agreement.

The *said letter* was sent to me by Mrs. W—— to explain fully your intense desire for a discussion of the subject of endless misery.

This letter was the *first* about the discussion, and was virtually a challenge, and was read publicly to my congregation, with your articles of agreement.

I have mislaid or destroyed said letter,—not thinking that I should have to deal with misrepresentation and treachery.

But I have the privilege of referring to Mr. and Mrs. H—— W—— for proof of this letter. This materially changes the appearance of the whole matter. It places the approach—the challenge to the discussion, on *yourself*; and yet you have striven in various ways, to place it upon me.

And by leaving this letter out, and giving my letter of May 31, 1869 (which was in reply to it), as the *first* communication, you make the Discussion to appear as if I was the suing party.

And then, as you deny (in the letter of June 4, 1869) being the *first mover* in this matter, you make the Discussion (by leaving out this letter) to prove *me* in an untruth, when the fact rests on *you*.

Because the *said letter* was addressed to Mrs. W. it does not become divorced from the correspondence, on the question between us. It was all about *the Discussion* and nothing else—it was the only data, from which to proceed.

You might as well say that your *birth* did not belong to your *life*, as to say, that this letter did not belong to this Debate.

AGREEMENT.

Being about to engage in a discussion concerning the truth or falsity of the religious doctrines we respectively hold, we make, at the beginning of such discussion, the following agreement :

1st. We will accept as an authoritative book of reference, the common English version of the Holy Bible.*

2d. Any part of this discussion may be made public, previous to its completion, if both parties shall so consent.

3d. After its close, this discussion may be made public by either party without consent of the other, provided that no part thereof shall be omitted.

In token of our mutual consent to the above,

Witness our hands,

LUCY A. PROUTY.

E. S. FOSTER.

*Webster's Dictionary was originally inserted, but was withdrawn at Mr. Foster's request.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. FOSTER'S FIRST LETTER.

CHESTER, VT., May 31st, 1869.

MISS PROUTY,—*Madam* :—Sometime since, I received intimations that you desired to open a written discussion on the truth or falsity of the religious doctrines we respectively hold.

Yesterday a written statement was handed to me, specifying, in some particulars, how the correspondence shall proceed.

You seem desirous to enter upon a religious discussion, and bring me into a channel which will necessarily control my thought and expression to your line of argument; you ask me to discuss a vital subject about the soul's salvation, in the language and definitions of Orthodoxy.

Now, if you desire to discuss the truth or falsity of our particular religious tenets in sincerity, and with the prayer to know more of the Great Father, more of His Only Son, and more of Jesus' Mission, I am ready to do it, in the spirit of prayer and humility, before God, and our blessed Saviour, on the *Bible* foundation and that *only*; or on the basis of the Greek Lexicons. I cannot be limited by your Orthodox Webster; neither will I ask you to be circumscribed by Unitarian Worcester.

We will take the Bible and define our positions from your Greek Orthodox Lexicons; this is all you can sincerely ask of me, I think.

You see at once the impropriety of your request, with regard to Webster.

I have a desire to say further, that I can engage in this labor with you only on condition that it be with a sincere prayer for the good of us both, and the highest welfare of the undying souls around us. I must, at all times, hold you to the test of the soul's final destiny. It is a serious subject to enter upon, and one not to be trifled with.

If you desire this discussion for your peace and happiness here and hereafter, and for the welfare and redemption of dying humanity around us, praying that whatever error is now in our minds and hearts may be removed, I will say, in the love and fear of God, I will enter the discussion.

I ask no more for myself than I will grant to you; yea, more, as far as evidences for my faith are concerned, I will agree to furnish *two*, to your one for your belief.

You may hold me to this offer throughout the discussion, if you desire.

With these specifications, I wait your reply. If you acquiesce in the foregoing, please state your desired question.

With much esteem, I am truly yours in Christ,

E. S. FOSTER.

MISS PROUTY'S SECOND LETTER.

CHESTER, VT., June 4th, 1869.

REV. E. S. FOSTER,—*Sir*:—Your letter dated the 31st ult., was received last night. On considering its contents I perceived three points to which I propose to reply in order.

First: I wish to put the origin of my proposal to engage in discussion with you, in its true light. I consider myself as really the challenged party. For more than six months, I have been frequently hearing of your desire to hold discussion with some one of the Orthodox belief; of your disappointment that no one was apparently willing to meet you, and that you were inclined to believe that it was because they (the Orthodox believers) lacked confidence in the doctrines they professed to hold, or courage to defend them. Therefore when, in conversation with Mrs. W—— lately, I again heard these statements repeated, I said: "Tell Mr. Foster that I will discuss with him, provided it be done in writing. I am not a minister; I have neither great education, nor power of eloquence, but if he will condescend to meet one of my standing, I will try and prove no coward. If he beats me, I will acknowledge it frankly and govern myself in future accordingly."

Second: You decline to accept of Webster's Dictionary, as an authentic book of reference, because Webster was Orthodox in belief, and say that I "seem desirous to bring you into a channel

which will necessarily control your thought and expression to my line of argument."

I deny the charge, and am no less surprised that you should bring it, than I am to learn that the correctness of Webster's definitions are questioned by any; or that his religious belief rendered him incapable of correctness. I proposed Webster's Dictionary because I own it, and do not the other. Worcester's religious belief I learned for the first time from your letter.

I know of some eminent Universalists, who have no hesitation in accepting Webster as authority: however, as your objection, with its reason, will doubtless prove as valuable to me in the discussion as your acceptance of the terms proposed, I withdraw Webster.

My library is at present no better supplied with Greek Lexicons than with Worcester's Dictionaries; therefore I am compelled to decline them, wondering however why the orthodoxy of Scott and others is less objectionable than that of Webster.

It remains for me, therefore, to accept your offer to discuss the proposed subject "on the Bible foundation and that only." I return you the reforemy copy of agreement, with Webster crossed out; which, if it now contains nothing objectionable, you will please sign and return to me.

Third: You desire to know fully, both the motive I have in engaging in this discussion, and the spirit and frame of mind with which I shall commence, and continue it.

Sir, as already intimated, I offer myself as a weak and humble champion to defend what I believe to be the truth of God. Sixteen years ago I consecrated myself to this cause, not in a "trifling spirit," but seriously and solemnly. I fervently pray that God may be pleased to bless my poor efforts in its behalf, and to that end, that He will keep my heart from the stain of all selfish or unworthy motives. By striving, as I am given the power, against every form of darkness and error, I hope to promote the welfare of
 | "dying humanity around us."

I cannot assure you that this "discussion is desired for my peace and happiness here and hereafter," for my peace and happiness *here* are gained and kept by different means, and *hereafter* they will stand upon a different foundation; and I have no faith that this

discussion will effect either, only as I may be permitted to experience the consciousness of right intentions.

You will find me to be intensely in earnest. I shall do my best to pull your arguments to pieces, and to put mine together so that you cannot pull them to pieces. While I make no claim to freedom from the traditional obstinacy of my sex, I hope to be found possessed also of a true woman's scorn for everything opposed to candor, impartiality or earnest love for the good and true.

Having thus defined my position, I will only add that it is immaterial to me with what particular question we commence; if you insist upon it, however, declare unto me the meaning of Luke xvi: 19, 31: If you prefer to commence with anything else, however, do so. Choose your own ground and your own style. Here I stand, opposed to your doctrines, which I believe to be fatally erroneous and opposed to scripture, to reason and the best interests of "dying humanity around us."

Very sincerely yours,

L. A. PROUTY.

MR. FOSTER'S SECOND LETTER.

CHESTER, VT., June 11, 1869.

MISS PROUTY,—*Madam*:—Your favor, of the 4th inst., is just before me, and its contents considered.

I do not consider that I have challenged any person to discuss any religious tenets, unless you call this a challenge, viz., "I would like to see some true believer in the Calvinistic creed come forward and attempt its defence before this community." So, as I understand it, I am virtually the *challenged party*. But let this pass, it is of no consequence, as I am ready at all times to defend the cause of my Heavenly Father, the Blessed Saviour, and the Great Redemption, to the utmost ability of my feeble powers.

I am glad Calvinism in Chester has one brave heart, with sufficient moral strength, intellect and real ability to attempt its defence.

You say, "If Mr. Foster beats me in the discussion, I will acknowledge it frankly, and govern myself in the future accordingly." Now, I take up this work with you—not as a theological fight, but as a work of devotion, and with an earnest prayer that we may know more about God, about the Great Redeemer, and the

extent of salvation. I feel myself so much of a humble follower of the Master as to be open to the reception of all *truth* and evidence of God and Christ, and the means of grace. I trust that you will do none the less.

We must remember that it is one thing to be a disputant, and it is *another* and very *different thing* to be a *devoted believer* and *defender of the faith*.

Believing that you will enter this work in the *latter character*, I accept your proposal, and sign your conditions.

But I have a suggestion to make, viz.: You propose to begin by having me state my views of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.—Luke xvi: 19 to 31. I have no objection to giving you my views on the said parable; but the better course is to open and continue a discussion on some particular question that would necessarily involve all we could say on the subject. I think we should have some question admitting an affirmative and negative answer, to be argued, as we believe, on the basis of the Bible.

For instance: Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine, that God is partial and limited in his purposes of salvation? Or this, viz. Do the scriptures teach the final triumph of sin and evil? Or this: Does the Bible teach the endless misery of any one of our race?

Or, to reverse our relations to the question, will you take this, viz. Do the Scriptures teach that the Will, Purpose, and Promise of God shall be fulfilled? Or this, viz. Do the the Scriptures teach the final salvation of all souls?

You see that either question will permit us to bring forward any or all scripture, which we think supports our belief. I think, in order to do justice, and be the means in the hands of God of saving souls, we must discuss two questions; one of which will bring you in the affirmative and the other place you in the negative.

If you knew my many cares and duties, you would think it impossible for me to engage in this discussion; hence, what I do must be done hastily and imperfectly. I write very rapidly, and on reading over I often find many errors,—so I must ask one favor at your hands, viz. as I shall have no time to re-write any thing, my corrections must be received simply with a *pen mark* across the word spelled wrongly, or the word misused, and so left to be rectified when these things are to be made public.

I hope and trust that you are not so pressed with care and duty as to need such a favor. I ask no more for myself, however, than I grant to you. Hoping and praying that the Holy Spirit may guide us in the way of truth,

I remain truly yours in Christ,

E. S. FOSTER.

MISS PROUTY'S THIRD LETTER.

CHESTER, VT., June 15th, 1869.

REV. E. S. FOSTER,—*Sir*:—Yours of the 11th inst. was received last night. The question as to which of us can claim the right to be regarded as the challenged party may safely be left for the decision of others. The circumstances under which I made the offer I did having already been stated, I have nothing more to add, except that I certainly should have regarded the language, "I would like to see some true believer in the Calvinistic creed come forward and attempt their defence before this community," as a challenge, as I doubt not those did who may have heard it; for the impression certainly prevails among those who have listened to you that the Orthodox community have been challenged and dare not respond.

You remark, "I am glad that Calvinism, in Chester, has one brave heart, with sufficient moral strength, intellect and real ability to attempt its defence."

I am at a loss whether to regard such language as meant to flatter me, or to reproach my brethren and sisters in belief. Perhaps both were intended. But I deem it in bad taste, to say the least, for you to express yourself in such terms, either to me, or to the public, as I am informed you did on a late occasion. Your acquaintance with me is not sufficiently intimate to warrant such language; and being in a community where I have lived since my birth, I am conscious of being so well known that such extravagant encomiums can but prove as utterly ineffective toward others as toward myself. I trust never to hear them repeated.

I deny that Calvinism, (or Orthodoxy), in Chester, "has but one brave heart;" it has hundreds ready to seal their faith with their lives if need be. I deny that Calvinism, (or Orthodoxy), in Chester, "has but one with sufficient intellect and real ability to attempt its defence," for I flatter myself that the followers of that faith will

compare favorably, in point of intellect, with the same number of their opposers, in this or any other community. The reason why they have not done so is probably because the same motives have not been presented to them as have influenced myself.

You speak of the difference between a disputant, and a faithful believer and defender. If I did not faithfully believe and desire to defend my doctrine, I should never dispute that which opposes it.

You propose, instead of taking up the account of the rich man and Lazarus, to commence by considering some question having a negative and affirmative. I agree. You proceed to suggest a few.

The first does not appear to me to state the subject distinctly. My belief would compel me to take the negative of the second, probably contrary to your expectations. The third, viz. "Does the Bible teach the endless misery of any one of our race?" will serve our purpose well, and is accepted. I take the

AFFIRMATIVE,

and lay down my propositions thus :

1st. The Bible everywhere makes a broad distinction between two classes called, by the general names of the righteous and the wicked.

2d. This distinction is everywhere represented as resulting from God's love of righteousness and abhorrence of wickedness.

3d. There will be a final and eternal separation between these two classes, the one enjoying eternal happiness, the other suffering everlasting punishment.

From the large number of texts believed to establish these three propositions, but a single one will be selected for each. For the first, Ps. 1: 1-6; for the second, Ps. 11: 5-7; for the third, 2 Thess. 1: 7-10.

This will probably furnish you material for as long a letter as you will wish to write for your next.

I do not wish that this discussion should take such a form as to necessitate lengthy manuscripts, for my own time and strength are already pretty fully taxed, and I write but a few sentences at a time. The difference between the date of my letter and that of the post mark, will show how much time I require, even for a short letter.

Most heartily do I wish that, conducted candidly and earnestly,

this discussion may, by God's blessing, "be the means of saving souls" from all the fearful consequences of fatal error. And as we search His word to learn His truth, may God send us willing hearts and guiding light. Sincerely yours,

L. A. PROUTY.

P. S.—You have spoken of Calvinism, using the word as synonymous with Orthodoxy. Let us preserve a distinction. I propose to defend Orthodox religion, not restrict myself to the peculiar doctrines of either Calvin, Luther, Wesley, or any other man.

L. A. PROUTY.

NEGATIVE.

CHESTER, VT., June 25th, 1869.

MISS PROUTY,—*Madam*.—Yours of the 15th inst. came in time; and this day is my first opportunity for a reply.

I am sorry you did not at once select your question, and fill up your communication with argument in defence of what you believe to be truth.

Your method begs the question, but throws me into the affirmative, and to be accommodating and gentlemanly, I will at once accept your arrangement.

You say you will take the question, "Does the Bible teach the endless misery of any one of our race?" And you agree to sustain the affirmative, and give your propositions thus:—1st. "The Bible everywhere makes a broad distinction between the two classes, called by the general names of the righteous and the wicked." Your 2d is this, viz. "This distinction is everywhere represented as resulting from God's love of righteousness and abhorrence of wickedness."

To these two propositions I make no reply, as they are fully believed and sustained by all Universalists with whom I am acquainted. They are embodied in our faith as a part of Universalism.

Your third and last proposition is this, viz. "There will be a final and eternal separation between these two classes,—the one enjoying eternal happiness and the other suffering everlasting punishment." And all your argument is this, viz. "From a large number of texts believed to establish this proposition, but a single

selection will be made." 2 Thess. 1: 7 to 10. This is the sum and substance of your selection, argument, and text, for the affirmative.

On this method I make no comment. Your proof text is this, viz. 2 Thess. 1: 7 to 10. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

This epistle was written from Corinth, A. D. 54, and the second coming of Christ took place, about A. D. 70, "in His kingdom, in power, in glory, and with his angels." (See Adam Clark, Drs. Hammond and Gill.) And the Scriptures affirm that his second coming will take place before the disciples "shall have gone over the cities of Israel," before some of them "tasted death," and "in that generation." See Matt. x: 23 and xvi: 27, 28 and xxiii: 36 and xxiv: 34.

These facts settle beyond a doubt the time of Christ's second coming, and confine the subject matter of this epistle to that time and circumstance.

The phrase, "in flaming fire taking vengeance," is simply another description of the terrible judgment coming on the rebellious Jews, which is mentioned in Luke, xxi: 22, 23, and Matt. xxiv: 21.

The words, "flaming fire," are simply a figurative description of the severe punishment of sin. Inspiration often represents punishment by the figure of fire. Remember, here, that fire never *destroys*, but *purifies*,—separating the spurious from the pure. Just so with punishment; therefore it cannot be endless.

The phrase, "them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," is a full and perfect description of the Jews in the time of Christ.

Concerning the phrase, "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,"—we are told, by the learned, that the word *everlasting* is from the Greek "*aionion*," which, by Donnegan (Orthodox) is defined "age" or "dispensation." The Greek word "*olethros*," rendered "destruction," is (by Donnegan) defined to mean "scourge or plague." The literal meaning of the passage is,

doubtless, this, viz. "these shall suffer punishment, even (*aionion*, or age-scourging) from the presence of the Lord." That is, they were, as a people, to be scourged out *of*, or debarred *from* their long accustomed access to their temple devotions, which, to the Jewish understanding, was an access to the presence of the Lord.

This Apostolic prediction was a re-affirmation of the Prophet, recorded in Jeremiah, *xxiii*: 39. This was a prophecy of the dispersion of the Jews from their city and temple. The temple in Jerusalem was called, by way of eminence, the presence of the Lord, because God promised to meet the people there, and manifest to them his presence and glory. "There dwelt the Shechinah, the emblem of the Divine presence, and the coming up of the people there was denominated the coming before the Lord; and, by a natural association, the city itself came to be called the presence of the Lord. It was so denominated because it was God's chosen place for the great national religious celebrations for his chosen people, even before the temple was erected. Accordingly, David, when driven by Absalom into the wilderness, expressed his longing for a return to Jerusalem, in the exclamation (*Ps. xlii*: 2) "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before God?" Now, no description could convey to the Jewish mind a more vivid picture of the most fearful national calamity, than the assurance that they should be permanently expelled from the place of their communion with God—their city and temple; or, as the apostle describes it in the text, "suffering punishment, even *aionion* scourging from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." Though this is an *aionion* scourging, it is not endless, for, when the "fullness of the Gentiles shall be come in, all Israel shall be saved." Romans, *xi*: 26.

I see nothing in the passage you have given that makes any reference to the final salvation of souls in the future life, or that pertains to us, except to show us how God dealt with his ancient people, and that the consequences of sin and rebellion against Him are certain. That I am right in the explanation and use of your texts, I refer you to your own celebrated Doctors of Divinity,—Drs. Hammond, Gill, and Bishop Cappe,—all of whom explain your text just as I have.

Again. If 2 Thess. *i*: 7 to 10, proves endless misery or Orthodoxy, how does it happen that the judgment was absolutely

unconditional; that none of your celebrated conditions, or terms of salvation (so called) were offered to the said sinners? It says, "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." It says this punishment "*shall be*;" notice, it does not say *unless* they repent, be converted, or be born again,—but "*shall be*."

A very singular accordance with the Calvinistic system of Orthodoxy!

Again. If the text proves your faith (which you affirm is of so much worth that hundreds in Chester will give their lives for it), how does it happen that inspiration affirms that no one can escape from the presence of God's spirit? See Ps. cxxxix : 7.

I trust you will prayerfully, and for Jesus' sake, consider this whole matter with much care.

Most truly yours in Faith, Hope, and Charity,

E. S. FOSTER.

AFFIRMATIVE.

CHESTER, VT., July 2d, 1869.

REV. E. S. FOSTER,—*Sir*:—Yours dated June 25th has just been received.

In reply to your prefatory remarks, I have only to say, that after declining to commence the discussion as I requested you to do, "choosing your own ground and your own style," and referring the privilege back to me, you have little reason to find fault with the manner in which I chose to do it. However, if it is any privilege to you to criticise my style, you have my permission to enjoy it to the full; as I make no claims to superior merit in that line. I may, hereafter, furnish you still further material for the exercise of your criticism.

You say "That my method begs the question and throws you into the affirmative." The phrase "begging" the question is familiar to me, but in the name of logic what question did I beg? You suggested several questions for my choice. I took my choice, wrote it down exactly as you gave it, took the affirmative myself, and in your reply you argued on the negative. Therefore I do not guess your meaning.

I expected you would accept my first and second propositions

without argument, I advanced them in order to secure common ground at the outset, and if spared to complete this discussion shall probably show you the use that I have for them.

You seem disappointed that I gave but a single text in support of my third proposition; well that text cost you just six pages of writing, and may cost you more, unless you surrender it; brought into the discussion ten Scripture references, also references to four different commentators and the Greek Lexicons. One would suppose that that would do to begin with, but have patience, sir; there are plenty more coming.

I proceed to review your explanation of 2 Thes. 1: 7-10.

"The Lord Jesus revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels," means the appearance of the Roman armies before Jerusalem.

"In flaming fire taking vengeance," means scourging severely—plaguing.

"Them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," means the Jews.

"Everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," means banished for an age or dispensation from Jerusalem.

Simply and literally then, you would have this passage read:—*And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Roman armies shall appear to scourge the Jews, who shall, for an age or dispensation, be driven away from Jerusalem.* To sustain this reading you quote authorities as mentioned above, to be considered in due time.

First, I object to the rendering of *aionion* as meaning age-lasting,—the true signification of *aion* is "everbeing," "eternity," and in whatever connection the word is used, it always means the longest duration of which the thing referred to is capable. The adjective derived from this noun (*aionion*, *aionios*) is used in the New Testament sixty-six times; twice in relation to God and his glory, fifty-one times concerning the happiness of the righteous, six of miscellaneous subjects, with the plain signification of endless, and seven times concerning future punishment.

Now the meanings, "age, life, dispensation," are only secondary and incidental meanings, as every one knows who has ever looked into a Greek Lexicon. It will not do at all to take an incidental meaning of any word and interpret any book according to it. For instance, an incidental and commonly accepted meaning of charity,

is *alms-giving*; take this and interpret 1 Cor. 13th chapter by it, and it will read about as sensibly as your rendering of 2 Thess. i: 7-10, and give much comfort to many purse-proud specimens of "sounding brass" in the world.

I have noticed that Universalists distribute the meaning of *aion* and its derivatives very skillfully; whenever used in connection with future happiness, then they mean forever, without any doubt, but, whenever found in connection with any threatening to the wicked, then age, life, or dispensation is meant, no matter if both expressions are in the same verse. (See Matt. xxv: 46.) Such trimming of language, though confessedly ingenious, can certainly lay no claim to be considered as scholarly.

Second, I do not object to your rendering of *olethros*, or to your assertion that, philosophically speaking, fire does not destroy any thing; for orthodox Christians do not believe in annihilation, but as the scourging is to be everlasting, "forever," "eternal," "without end," (See Job, xxii: 4-7. Ps. ix: 5; xcii: 7. Isa. xxxiv: 10, xxxiii: 14. Matt. xviii: 8; xxv: 46. Mark iii: 29; ix: 47-48. Jude, 13,) and as this punishment, expressed in different words, is to "abide and shall continue;" (See Jer. xxx: 23. John, iii: 36,) and as those who suffer it can never enter heaven; (See Matt. v: 20. Luke, xiii: 27-28; xvi: 26. John, iii: 5; viii: 21. I Cor. vi: 9-10. Gal. v: 19-21. Eph. v: 5. Heb. iii: 11-18; vi: 4-6; x: 26-31. Rev. xxi: 27,) we *do* believe that if the Bible teaches anything clearly, it teaches that the punishment of the wicked is to be indeed endless.

In regard to the fact of which you remind me, viz.,—"That fire only destroys the connection with impurity." I remark that all figures are necessarily imperfect in some respect, and we must expect it will be so when the language of a finite being is used to convey knowledge of things pertaining to the infinite. The Saviour knew this, and, to prevent any excusable mistake, spoke of "fire that should never be quenched," and so did the prophets. (See Isa. lxvi: 24. Matt. iii: 12. Mark ix: 43-48.) If the fire here spoken of was only to destroy connection with impurity, it is manifest that after that connection was destroyed the fire would be quenched.

Your method of reasoning, it will at once be perceived, is different from that employed by Orthodox believers. We believe

what God has chosen to reveal to us whether we can understand it or not. You argue that, because the thing revealed is beyond your understanding, therefore it cannot be true.

Third, I object to your application of this passage to the destruction of Jerusalem. Presuming, by your references, that you regard the phrases, "coming of the Lord," "coming of the Son of Man, etc.," all to be equivalent to each other, and all to refer to this same historical event, I proceed to remark that, in my view of the matter, such a reference is impossible.

(1.) Because none of the circumstances, which are declared shall accompany Christ's coming, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. The righteous were not "gathered together" there. (Matt. xxiv: 31.) On the contrary, Christ warned them, on receiving a particular sign, to *flee*. (Matt. xxiv: 15, 16.) The coming of Christ was to be sudden, "as a thief in the night," "as the lightning." But the destruction of Jerusalem was not sudden, —coming at the close of a three years' war and after five months' siege. At the time of the coming of Christ, all nations were to be gathered for a general and particular judgment, and each should receive according to his works. (Matt. xxv: 31-46; II Cor. v: 10.) All nations were not gathered at the destruction of Jerusalem; neither did the comparatively mere handful who were there, receive "according to their works;" for the innocent and the helpless, alike with the cruel and the treacherous, suffered from the sword, the famine and the exile.

(2.) I have very serious doubts whether any person even imagined that he saw "the son of man coming in a visible and personal manner at that time." (See Dan. vii: 13; Matt. xxiv: 30; John, xiv: 1-4; Acts, i: 9-11; Rev. i: 7; Col. iii: 4.) Certainly, we have now no knowledge that anything transpired, at that time, which bears any adequate resemblance to the things thus foretold.

(3.) Christ himself expressly declared that he would not come at the destruction of Jerusalem. (See Matt. xxiv: 23-27.)

(4.) In 2 Thess. i: 7, *rest* is promised to the righteous, who were troubled, at the time when the Son of Man should come; promises of similar import are elsewhere made. Now it is a matter of history that the Christians suffered far severer persecution after the destruction of Jerusalem than before.

(5.) If 2 Thess. i: 7-10 refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, why does the apostle warn those to whom he is writing, that the time is not near? (See 2 Thess. ii: 1-3.)

(6.) Again. If 2 Thess. i: 7-10 refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, have there been two such events? (See II Thess. ii: 7, 8.)

(7.) To what coming does John refer in I John, ii: 28; iv: 17; Rev. i: 7, and xx: 11-15; which were written from thirty to thirty-five years after Jerusalem was destroyed?

But you give me some texts that seem to you to prove that the coming of Christ to judgment must have taken place "about A. D. 70." Before commencing their examination, let me remark that Orthodox christians consider that the phrase "coming of Christ" is used in five different senses in the New Testament, none of them referring to the destruction of Jerusalem, but I do not propose to enter upon a specification of them in this letter.

Your first text is Matt. x: 23, "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come."—These words occur in the exhortation given to His disciples when Christ sent them forth under commission to go through the cities of Israel preaching the gospel *unto Jews only*. Now, as a matter of fact, they did go over all the cities of Israel—returned to Christ, received from Him a broader commission to preach the gospel throughout the world, to Gentiles as well as Jews; that they did travel, preach and establish churches throughout the then civilized world; and, with the exception of John, were all in their graves before A. D. 70. Is it not more rational to suppose you are mistaken in your application of this text, than to think the Saviour uttered a falsehood?

Your second text is Matt. xvi: 27, 28. My objection to your application of this text, as before remarked, is in the fact that *every* man was not then, i. e. about A. D. 70, "rewarded according to his works."

Matt. xxiii: 36 derives all its force as a Universalist argument from the manner in which you define "generation." Take the real, essential meaning, viz., race, breed, kind, sort, species; and there is no difficulty in perceiving that it may refer to something yet to be fulfilled, for, in the providence of God, the Jewish race have not yet passed away, but are still a distinct and peculiar peo-

ple, though existing for centuries under circumstances that would have entirely obliterated all trace of any other nation long ago. But you prefer, as in the case of *aion*—to take a secondary meaning, viz., “thirty years, or the average time from the birth of a man until he has a son;” but there is still a difficulty, for, in that sense, all these things did not come upon that generation, but upon the next one; Matt. xxiv: 34, is open to the same objection.

Fourth, I object to your limiting the phrase “presence of the Lord” to the city or temple of Jerusalem. Although aware that it is sometimes used in that sense, yet I deny that it is, with sufficient frequency to dictate the interpretation in 2 Thes. i: 7-10, where, as already shown, there are so many things inconsistent with the idea. Consider also the following references, viz., Ps. li: 11; cxiv: 7; cxxxix: 7; cxl: 13; Jer. v: 22; Acts, iii: 19; 1 Cor. i: 29; Rev. xiv: 10.

Fifth, I object to limiting the phrase, “them that know not God, and obey not the gospel,” to the Jews, until you first prove that they were the only people who answer to this description. I believe that, if the apostle had meant to specify a particular nation, he would have known better how to do it, than to specify instead a certain character of people, having representatives in every nation. And I think you will not deny that specimens of this same class are still occasionally seen.

Sixth, For the correctness of your views, you refer me to certain Orthodox commentators, viz., Adam Clark, Drs. Hammond and Gill, and Bishop Cappe, “all of whom,” you say, “explain your text as I have done.” Permit me to reply, by quoting from Adam Clark’s commentary on this same text:

“With his mighty angels.” “The coming of Christ to judge the world is scarcely ever spoken of, in Scripture, without mention of angels who accompany him.” “In flaming fire”—“thunder and lightning.” “Taking vengeance”—“inflicting just punishment.” “Them that know not God and obey not the gospel”—“the heathen, those that know and will not acknowledge God, and have rejected the gospel.” “Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction”—“eternal continuance of substantial evil.” “From the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power”—“never to see the face of God throughout eternity.”

Verily, sir, I think you must understand Adam Clark in the same way you do Scripture, i. e., by the "rule of contrary!"

I have not had time to examine Drs. Hammond, Gill and Bishop Cappe, but am perfectly willing that they should agree with you as Adam Clark does!

Seventh, I propose now to reply to a paragraph so forcible in its character that I copy it in full:

"Again. If 2 Thess. i: 7-10, proves endless misery, or Orthodoxy, how does it happen the judgment was unconditional; there were none of your celebrated conditions or terms of salvation (so called) offered to the said sinners? It says, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. It says this punishment '*shall be.*' Notice, it does not say, unless they repent, be converted, or be born again, but '*shall be.*' A very singular accordance with the Calvinistic system of Orthodoxy!"

No conditions, sir! Now to my mind, the fact that the punishment was to be limited to "*them that know not God, and obey not the gospel,*" implies very plainly that the "conditions" of salvation were *knowledge of God and obedience to the gospel!* Notice, it does not say *all* shall be punished! only that a *certain class* shall; and any one is at liberty to come out of that class and escape. You say, "there were none of your celebrated conditions, unless they repent, be converted, or be born again." I beg leave to correct you, sir: these are not *our* conditions, however *celebrated* they may be. Nobody ever imposed these conditions but God and our Saviour. It was Jesus who uttered the words recorded in Matt. xviii: 3; Luke xii: 3-5, and John iii: 3.

The prophets exhorted to repentance; John the Baptist taught repentance; Jesus Christ preached repentance, and his apostles "went out and preached everywhere that men should repent." It is left for influential preachers of Universalism, in the noon of the nineteenth century, to speak of repentance scornfully as a doctrine peculiarly the invention of Orthodox Christians. Indeed, if it were the invention of Orthodox believers, we see from the Bible what their names were!

Your next question, "How does it happen that Inspiration affirms that no one can escape from the presence of God's spirit?" will be considered as relevant when I have affirmed that the phrase,

"presence of God," has only one signification. I think any one might easily have told the Psalmist whither he could flee from the temple, or from Jerusalem. And now, I also will ask you one question, and answer me.

Suppose that the Bible does not teach eternal punishment; and suppose that God should send us a new revelation in which he intended to teach it, will you just suggest some phrase, either in Greek or English, which shall express the idea plainly and fully, so that no one could misunderstand it?

Commending the foregoing considerations to your candid and prayerful attention,

I remain sincerely yours,

L. A. PROUTY.

If you still dislike my method of conducting the argument, please consider everything as unwritten, and commence it over again in your own way.

L. A. P.

NEGATIVE.

CHESTER, Vt., July 16th, 1869.

MISS PROUTY—*Madam*:—Your favor of the 2d. inst., mailed the 10th, is before me.

You seem to be in the dark about "*begging the question*," and say, "you do not guess my meaning." Did you not *select* the question from those I presented? Did you not *agree* to take the affirmative? Does it not belong to the affirmative to *open* the discussion, and open it too with something that is called argument? Was that *single quotation* opening an *argument to sustain the endless misery of some of our race*? Was not your statement, immediately after the one single text, "believing this text to afford you ample material for your next, I wait your reply," just the same thing as *begging* me to assume the opening? Was it not just the same as asking the negative to open the argument, that you might in reply take the negative and *force* me into the affirmative? To all these questions, I can conceive of no answer from you but — *Yes!*

Now, with all due respect and in the kindest spirit would I ask, in order that much time and labor may be saved, truth brought out and fully defended, much error exposed, and this discussion be

the means of saving many from darkness, error, and sin, that you will please take the affirmative of the question you selected, and write for the defence of endless misery, or argue to prove the said doctrine.

In all of your last letter, I have looked in vain to find you on the *affirmative*. You have assumed the *negative*, and made the attempt at argument against the explanation of 2 Thess. 1: 7 to 10, which you *begged* at my hands. But I will attempt to place myself on the negative, and reply to you, though it is a very awkward position, in connection with your assumption.

You say that your *one quotation* "cost me six pages of writing, and that it will cost me many more unless I surrender it."

I wrote just enough to explain it on its true basis, and gave you the evidence for the same. And, with all your criticisms and quotations, I do not consider that you have in any way met the question at issue. Your use of "*aionion*," and especially of "*aion* and *aionios*" meets with very serious objection from the learned and from common usage, and especially from the New Testament usage.

First. The learned Aristotle, (T. B. T.'s Theo. of Uni., p. 338,) Homer, Herodotus, Isocrates and Xenophon, Sophocles, Donnegan and Schleusner *do not define* "*aion*" and its derivatives as you have done. Please see the said authors. From them we learn that "*aion* and *aionios*" are used to signify indefinite time, limited and determined by the subject or connection, and that this can be abundantly demonstrated.

Again. "Usage," says one of the best scholars, (Theo. of Uni., p. 338,) "determines the meaning of words. Lexicographers do not create meanings or definitions, but report them, as gathered from the usage of popular writers and standard authors of the language." "It is not the definition which the critic may force upon the words, or the philologist wring from the roots, but the popular sense and usage, that we have to deal with," says one of the ablest authors.

Again. The New Testament's usage of the words, "*aion* and *aionios*," is opposed to your criticism. For the words, "*aion* and *aionios*," in the New Testament rendered everlasting, eternal, forever, occur not less than one hundred and seventy-nine times, and yet, are applied to punishment only nine times. The expression,

"everlasting punishment," is found once only; "eternal damnation," once only; "everlasting destruction," once only, and "everlasting fire," twice.

If these phrases do really set forth a life of endless pain, and Jesus came to announce this as the doom of the wicked, it is beyond measure astonishing that he should mention it, in this form, only once or twice, in the whole course of his ministry. Yet, this is the fact according to Matthew and Mark; and, if we had only the gospels of Luke and John, we should have no proof that he ever mentioned it at all; for they did not attach sufficient importance to the fact, to record it in their account of his teachings!

Is it reasonable to suppose that, if these phrases had such a terrible meaning, they would have forgotten or neglected to say that Christ uttered them? If they had understood him to mean this, (endless misery,) would not the special form of speech he used have graven itself into their memory?

Again. If the phrases, in review, were chosen of Jesus to express the dreadful doctrine of *endless torture*, is it probable that Paul, Peter and Jude would employ them only *once* in their epistles? John and James not at all? Think for a moment of the faithful, earnest, out-spoken Paul really believing in this doctrine, and believing that Christ taught it in the phrases, "everlasting punishment" and "eternal damnation," and writing thirteen or fourteen epistles on religious doctrines, and preaching everywhere to Jews and Gentiles, and yet only *once* using this language! It is beyond belief.

Query. Were Jesus and Peter and Paul *faithful preachers*, if the terrible doctrine of *endless punishment* be true?

It must be confessed, by every just-minded person, that these facts furnish very strong evidence that the words, "*aion*" and "*aionios*," are not employed in the Scriptures to describe a condition of unending suffering; and, to use the language of one of the best scholars of the United States, "the popular sense and common usage of "*aion*" and "*aionios*" is that of indefinite time, limited and determined by the subject or connection, and every one familiar with Greek and ecclesiastical literature knows this to be the case." T. B. T., p. 343.

Though I could spend months in showing the error of your assumptions, and of the material you use to support them, and the

greatness and enormity of their unscripturalness, yet I deem this sufficient.

Here is your bold and unfortunate and untrue statement: viz., "I have noticed that Universalists distribute the meaning of '*aion*' and its derivatives, very skillfully. Whenever used in connection with future happiness, then they mean forever, without any doubt; but, whenever found in connection with any threatening to the wicked, then age, life, or dispensation is meant, no matter if both expressions are found in the same verse, as in Matt. xxv : 46."

To this I reply: I am acquainted with most of the doctrinal explanations, of the Old Testament and New Testament, given by Universalist believers, both living and dead, and yet, not in *one* instance, do I know of *one* of them using the word, "*aion*," as you affirm them to do. Your strong statement concerning the way in which we use the word "*aion*," when connected with future happiness, and in Matt. xxv : 46, should have something to sustain it beyond mere assertion,—especially when on so solemn a theme as / the soul's final destiny.

If the awful dogma of *endless misery* be a truth, there must be evidence to sustain it, aside from mis-statement, cant, or mere assertion.

I will only add further on this point, that we make no reliance on the word, "*aion*," or its derivatives for the final redemption or happiness of the race. As to its use in Matt. xxv : 46, it proves no more in the *one case* than in *the other*; they are simply set in contrast to each other, and we believe that neither appertains to *endless life* beyond the grave. Neither the life nor the punishment mentioned in Matt. xxv : 46, is referred to the immortal life beyond the tomb, for fulfillment. According to the account in Matt. xxv : 46, they are both confined to the earthly side of the resurrection,—to the mortal. The chapter is silent about repentance, new birth, death and resurrection.

The reference to Dr. A. Clark, in my last, was not to the explanation of 2 Thess. i : 7-10, but to the second coming of Christ, which took place about A. D. 70, "in his kingdom, in power, in glory and with his angels." I will quote you the words as I wrote them to you, viz.

"This epistle was written from Corinth A. D. 54, and the second coming of Christ took place about A. D. 70, 'in his kingdom, in

power, in glory, and with his angels.' See Drs. Adam Clark, Hammond and Gill."

Now, if you will turn back to my letter, you will see I am right. And, then if you will consult Dr. Adam Clark on Matt. xvi: 27, 28, you will find him agreeing with me, and disagreeing with you most radically.

I think, madam, that before you advertise about town that, "Mr. Foster referred you to Dr. Adam Clark on 2 Thess. i: 7-10, and you just wrote out Dr. C.'s comments on 2 Thess. i: 7-10, and showed him his great error," you should try to understand a small amount of truth, and remember Christ's teaching, where he says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and prophets."

As to your belief that the Bible teaches endless punishment clearly, I reply: You may *believe* it, but to *prove* it is a very different thing.

As to your large use of the Old Testament as evidence, I must set it all aside until you prove that it refers to the life immortal.

I believe and accept the Old Testament as Bible, as inspired, as the Word of God; but as to any revelations of the world to come, it is silent, if the New Testament be true, in my belief. About your reply to my use of the scripture figure of fire, there really seems to be nothing relevant to the point, for you surely ought to be acquainted with the fact, that the Old Testament, in the strongest language, speaks of "fire that shall not be quenched" and the "smoke that goeth up forever," and yet it was all on earth and long since ceased to burn.

Read Isaiah xxxiv: 8, 9, 10: "8. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion. 9. And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. 10. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever." Read Ezek. xx: 45, 46, 47, 48: "45. Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me saying: 46. Son of Man, set thy face towards the south, and prophesy against the forest of the south field; 47. And say to the forest of the south, Hear the word of the Lord: Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will kindle a fire in thee, and

it shall devour every green tree in thee, and every dry tree; the flaming flame shall not be quenched, and all faces from the south to the north shall be burned therein. 48. And all flesh shall see that I the Lord have kindled it; it shall not be quenched." Read Jer. xvii: 27: "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."

After reading the above, it will be folly to contend that the "unquenchable fire" is the invisible, spiritual wrath of God, in the world immortal.

Again, in Mal. iii: 3: "And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." This sets forth clearly the truth of my last argument, viz.: That fire only separates the base from the pure—the dross from the gold; and this text shows clearly that Christ and his gospel are refining powers like fire, but only to separate and purify. And the other figure in Mal. iii: 2: "like fuller's soap," has the same signification.

You see at once that we must meet this subject as honest and dying persons, and meet it from the Bible, too; and remember there is no excuse for us to deceive any person. It will not answer the demands of the undying soul in front of its immortal destiny to say "all figures are necessarily imperfect in some respect," and we must expect it will be so when the language of a finite being is used to convey knowledge of things pertaining to the infinite."

You accuse me of saying "that because the thing revealed is beyond my understanding, therefore it cannot be true." This is a superlative misrepresentation, that can plead no excuse. I have advanced no such thing, and a careful perusal of my last will show you that justice and truth are required to make us honest in a religious discussion.

Your references to Job xx: 4-7; Ps. ix: 5; xcii: 7; xxxiii: 14; Matt. xviii: 8; xxv: 46; Mark iii: 29; ix: 47, 48; Jude xiii: Jer. xxx: 23; Matt. v: 20; Luke xiii: 27, 28; xvi: 26; John iii: 5, 36; 1 Cor. vi: 9, 10; Gal. v: 19-21; Eph. v: 5; Heb. iii: 11, 18; vi: 4-6; x: 26-31; Rev. xxi: 27; I consider inadmis-

sible to the argument for which you use them, as proof, for on examination of the context, we find them applied (all of them) to subjects, times and circumstances in this world and life, and to the earthly side of the resurrection. They are applied (we find on examining the text and context) to persons on earth at the time or near the time of their special reference.

It will not answer to use them, and make bold inferences, and say—this is what is meant. ↓ The scriptures do not allow us to make additions *to* or subtractions *from* their truths and utterances. (Too much care and study cannot be used on the evidences, when the *undying soul* is the *issue*.)

I now come to your celebrated Orthodox conditions.

You, in the continuation of your negative argument to the close of your letter, assume that these are celebrated conditions from the Bible. How easy it is to assert a thing; but how difficult, sometimes, to find it in the Bible! Let us look at some of the many Bible conditions:

Jer. xxi: 14: "But I will punish you according to the fruit of your doings, saith the Lord." Prov. xi: 31: "They shall be recompensed in the earth." Isa. lvii: 16, 17, 18: "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made. For the iniquity of his covetousness was I wroth, and smote him; I hid me and was wroth, and he went on frowardly in the way of his heart. I have seen his ways, and will heal him; I will lead him also, and restore comforts unto him, and to his mourners." Ps. xix: 7: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. lxxv: 3: "As for our transgressions, thou wilt purge them away." John i: 29, 36: "The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Notice the condition, and remember it is the *sin of the world*, not of the *church* nor *righteous* nor *Orthodox professors*. Heb. ix: 26: "Sin shall be put away." Rom. xi: 25-27: "25. For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits,) that blindness in part has happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."

"26. And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, there shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

"27. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

"28. As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes."

"29. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

"30. For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief;"

"31. Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy."

"32. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all."

The above are celebrated Bible conditions, but not Orthodox.

Again, of Judah and Israel, God says: Jer. xxxiii: 8: "And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me."

Again in xxxi: "34: 34. "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor; and every man his brother, saying: Know the Lord; for they shall know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

33. But "this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." And yet these were the very persons who were to be burned with unquenchable fire. And in Isa. lxvi: 24; Rev. xiv: 10, 11; and in Matt. xxv: 46, were decreed to "go into everlasting punishment."

Again, Heb. viii: 10, 11, 12, 13: "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first

old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." Strange contradictions these, if Orthodoxy be true.

Again, 1 Sam. iii: 31, 32, 33: "For the Lord will not cast off for ever; But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies. For he does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." Very, very singular words from the Creator, if Orthodoxy is true.

Where are *your* celebrated conditions? So much from the Old Testament, which is silent on the life immortal. I bring them forward only to show the great inconsistency and unscripturalness of your last letter. We will enter the New Testament now, and see what the conditions are:

In Luke xix: 10, Jesus says, "I came to seek and save the lost." Mark ii: 17, "I came to call sinners to repentance." Luke iv: 18, 19, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath annointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." "To preach the acceptable year of the Lord. John iii: 7: "Ye *must* be born again." Not may be. John viii: 32: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Strange condition, if your doctrine is true.

Again, John iii: 35: "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hands." And in John vi: 37, Jesus says: "All that the Father giveth me shall come (not may come and have the offer of coming) to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." In John v: 25: "The dead shall hear my voice; and they that hear shall live." John vi: 45: "And they shall all be taught of God." John xii: 32 "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. Oh! strange, passing strange, are the infinite conditions of God, Christ and grace.

But where are *your* celebrated offers of salvation? When you can show that God and his prophets, and his only Son, our Saviour, did not mean what they said, did not understand the subject of the soul's salvation and the immortal destiny, it will be time for me to consider your "terms of salvation," as having some shade of reality.

You speak of our belief and preaching of repentance in a sneering manner, and yet I believe that there is no body of Christians who preach it so emphatically and believe it so thoroughly.

"You say it is left for inferential preachers of Universalism in the noon of the nineteenth century, to speak of repentance scornfully as a doctrine peculiarly the invention of Orthodox Christians."

"Inferential preachers of Universalism." Wonderful definition of those who are the closest searchers for evidence, and strongest and most tenacious for the text and context, of any believers. Astonishing definition from one whose *whole platform* is built on *inference*. And the last statement, "speak of repentance scornfully, as a doctrine peculiarly the invention of Orthodox Christians."

I defy you to show any proof of the correctness of this statement. I consider this unworthy of a reply. See Rom. 11: 1.

The Bible is very explicit in the statements that God has *purposed*, *promised* and *willed* the salvation of all men. See Eph. 1; Heb. vi: 13: Acts iii: 25, 26; 2 Tim. 1: 9, 10, 11; and 1 Tim. 1: 1-6.

Please take up the affirmative and defend it.

In all charity, I am yours in Christ,

E. S. FOSTER.

AFFIRMATIVE.

CHESTER, VT., July 30th, 1869.

REV. E. S. FOSTER,—*Sir*:—Your late kind and courteous epistle was duly received, has been carefully read and sufficiently admired. I shall reply according to the best of my benighted powers.

I will be candid, though by so doing I shall seem unto you as a fool.

I do not yet see that I have "begged the question, and thrown you into the affirmative;" though had you written a text-book on logic, some years since, I might possibly have thereby learned your somewhat peculiar views upon these things, however difficult the task of reconciling them with the views of others might prove.

"*Petitio principii*," or "begging the question," is defined by logicians as "the assuming of a principle which amounts to the thing to be proved, slightly disguising the act by variations of words so as to win your opponent's consent." This I have not done.

If you mean any thing by your Socratic mode of proving that I threw you into the affirmative," you mean that because I did not make a lengthy argument in favor of the side I chose, therefore, I

made none at all; and that because you made a longer one than I did, therefore you made the first, and because you made the first, therefore you argued the affirmative! And though the three propositions and references of my letter of June 15th, and the whole of my letter dated July 3d said "*yes*," to the question under consideration; and though the six pages of yours of July 25th said "*no*" to the same question, nevertheless you complain that you have looked in vain to find me on the affirmative." You insist that I am on the negative, and yet add almost immediately, "I will attempt to bring myself into a negative position, although it will be awkward work!" Doubtless you did find it so, judging from the result. I am content simply to state the above facts for the judgment of others.

Now, a few words about Adam Clarke, etc. You did use the language you quoted. Now remember, I had given you a particular text to explain, viz.: 2 Thess. i: 7-10. You were commencing your explanations; in this text a certain phrase occurred to which you had just assigned a signification, and in proof of your correctness referred me to Adam Clarke, *without alluding to any other text*.

Now, sir, what right had I to *guess* that instead of explaining the text you professed to be talking about, you were in reality talking about one over in Matthew?

I am aware that there are a few texts in Matthew and in some of the epistles where the phrase "coming of Christ" is by Clarke referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, but a different opinion is held by most of the eminent commentators; (see Doddridge, Burnet, Bengel, Barnes, Oxford Ed. P. Com., and the American Tract Society Notes;) and in my last I gave you some reasons for holding a different opinion myself. These reasons you have not yet replied to. But I would ask you if you consider it fair to bind me to Clark's opinions of Matt. xvi: 27, 28, etc., and refuse yourself to be bound by his opinion of 1 Cor. xv: 23; 1 Thess. ii: 19; iii: 13; iv: 15; v: 23; 2 Thess i: 7-10; ii: 1; 2 Peter iii: 4, 10; 1 John ii: 28, and other places? Remember that "under all circumstances you require no more of me than you are willing to grant in return."

I think, sir, that had you candidly acknowledged that, through haste or other sufficient cause, you had failed to give your mean-

ing as you intended it, it would have savored quite as much of Christian courtesy as it did to accuse me of misrepresentation, and recommend me "to understand a small amount of truth."

In this and many other places in your letter, you express your opinion of me personally by accusing me of "assumption" and "misrepresentation," qualified by various intensifying adjectives; "deception," "false statement," and "cant."

There is nothing at all original in all this; they are but the stereotyped expression of Universalist opinions of us all. Your opinion of me personally will doubtless be valuable to the public in some respects, though if it is intended to have any weight in deciding between our respective beliefs, would it not be better to have a greater degree of uniformity than one would remark in reading your *second* communication and your *last*?

To put all things of a kind together, there are some other points in your last to which I will reply in this connection.

1st. You remark thus: "You accuse me of saying, 'that because the thing revealed is beyond our knowledge it cannot be true,' and you pronounce this to be 'superlative misrepresentation, without a shadow of an excuse.'"

Perhaps my idea should have been more exactly expressed; but I did not wish to be understood as applying the remark to you personally, but to Universalists generally, using the pronoun "you" in the plural, just as you have done repeatedly to denote the body of Orthodox believers. Now, having had frequent opportunities during the past eighteen years of hearing Universalists express their views, I know that I have no need to excuse myself for stating so palpable a truth, which I now deliberately re-affirm.

I have found no form of argument so common among those of your faith, as the question, "Can you understand how such a thing can be?" Indeed, it is but little more than a year since I heard a young lady from Townshend, who was at that time visiting in this place, while arguing in defense of Universalism, declare emphatically that "she would not believe what she could not understand." I can at a proper time and place give you her name; also the names of several witnesses, some of whom are well known to you; but I do not deem it proper to do so in a letter which is to be made public.

2d. I said in my former letter, that I had noticed that "Uni-

versalists distribute the meaning of *aion* and its derivatives very skillfully; whenever used in connection with future happiness, then they mean forever, without doubt; but whenever found in connection with any threatening to the wicked, then age, life or dispensation is meant, no matter if both expressions are found in the same verse, as in Matt. xxv : 46."

This statement you pronounce "bold, unfortunate and untrue," because you are not guilty of so doing, and are unacquainted with any one who does so.

Well, sir, I have the advantage of you, then, in my acquaintance both with living and with dead defenders of your faith. I have in mind now a passage which I read ten years ago from the pen of that gifted writer, T. S. King, which was written upon that same Matt. xxv : 46, by which it did not appear to have occurred to him to deny that *aionion* meant eternal in the case of the righteous, for he took quite another way to explain the text. I have also by me the MSS. of three discussions held with as many different Universalists, from which I can draw proof, beside the very great number of conversations held with different persons on this subject. My "strong statement," therefore, having "something to sustain it beyond mere assertion," will not be retracted.

3d. You seem greatly excited over a phrase, which, according to your quotation, reads, "inferential preachers of Universalism." My copy of my last letter, has it "*influential* preachers," etc., which is different, you perceive. Please look at my last once more, and correct the word if you find it necessary. My language was "it is left for influential preachers of Universalism in the noon of the nineteenth century to speak of repentance scornfully," etc.

You say you do not know of any one who speaks of repentance scornfully; defy me to prove it, and affirm that "no class of preachers preach repentance so emphatically, or believe in it so thoroughly as do Universalists."

In the two former cases, you took to yourself language that I intended to have a general application; but in this case, *I mean you*. You are the influential preacher who has spoken of repentance scornfully, and you did so in your former letter, and you did it in the words: "*How does it happen that there were none of your 'celebrated conditions or terms of salvation (so called) offered to the said sinners.'* It does not say unless they repent, be converted or be

born again!" There is my proof over your own sign manual, but there is no particular need for you to reply if you do not choose.

As to there being "no class who preach repentance so emphatically or believe in it so thoroughly" as do Universalists, I have only to remark that it must be repentance with a different definition from what we use, since it makes no change of character necessary, but with or without its exercise the black-hearted and red-handed assassin and traitor together with his noble, pure-minded and patriotic victim enter upon the bliss of Heaven! Another strong statement for you, but one I am well able to prove.

Let us now clear the ground a little and proceed with the discussion.

The question is: "Does the Bible teach the endless misery of any one of our race?" To this question I have replied: "1st. *The scriptures everywhere make a broad distinction between two classes called by the general names of the righteous and the wicked.*" This you grant to be true. "2d. *This distinction is everywhere represented as resulting from God's love of righteousness and abhorrence of wickedness.*" The truth of this is also granted. "3d. *There will be a final and eternal separation between these two classes, the righteous enjoying eternal happiness, and the wicked suffering everlasting punishment.*" On this you join issue.

In support of this proposition, (remembering that we were to discuss "on the Bible foundation, and that only,") I advanced 2 Thess. 1: 7-10. This text you explained as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem. I reviewed your explanation,—showing wherein and why I believed your view to be erroneous.

Against my reasoning, you have attempted to sustain your explanation on two points only: viz., the meaning of *aion* and its derivatives, and the force of the term, "unquenchable fire." You also introduce two new points: viz., that the Old Testament is silent on the subject of the soul's immortality; and what are the Bible conditions of salvation. To these points I proceed to reply.

1st. In regard to the meaning of *aion* and its derivatives, the matter stands simply thus: I say that the true and prime meaning of the word is "everlasting, eternity; and that, in whatever connection it is found, it always denotes the longest duration of which the thing referred to is capable." You deny this, and affirm that "it always denotes a time limited by its connection." Both of us

claim the authority of the lexicons. Very well; let Greek scholars decide between us.

By the way, when you talk of the opinion of "the learned," do you recollect that a very respectable number of the first scholars the world has ever seen, have been and are found in the ranks of Orthodox believers?

I am able to furnish you the names of three young men, formerly students of Chester Academy, and afterwards of Middlebury College, the sons of Universalist parents, and strong in that faith, who became converted to Orthodoxy while engaged in the study of the Greek Testament. Two of these young men, standing in our Church, each testified thus:

"I was always taught that, though the English version of the Bible, in some places, might seem to teach eternal punishment, yet the original taught universal salvation clearly; but I found it very different; and I now declare that those men who teach that everlasting punishment is a doctrine not authorized by the Greek Testament, either know not what they say, or they mean to deceive."

Are you able to give me the names of any believers in Orthodoxy who have been converted to Universalism in a similar manner?

I agree with the statement that "Lexicographers do not create meanings or definitions, but report them as gathered from the usage of popular writers and standard authors of the language." Now then, how do the New Testament writers use *aion* and its derivatives?

They use them first, in relation to God and his Glory and the duration of his kingdom, where, of necessity, they *must* mean endless duration; second, by far the larger proportion of times they are used in speaking of the happiness of the righteous, which no one doubts will be endless; only some fifteen times remain to be disposed of, out of one hundred and nineteen,—nine of them referring to the punishment of the wicked, and six to miscellaneous subjects. Now let any honest lexicographer make his report accordingly.

But take another phrase, viz., "*eis tous aionas ton aionon*." This expression, which I affirm means literally "through the eternity of eternities," is found in the New Testament, if I have counted rightly, eleven times, and, in nine of these, it is applied to the duration and glory of God's government, which in their very nature

forbid the idea of limitation, and in the other two to future punishment. The references are Gal. i : 5 ; Phil. iv : 20 ; 2 Tim. iv : 18 ; Heb. xiii : 21 ; 1 Pet. iv : 11 ; v : 11 ; Rev. i : 6, 18 ; v : 13 ; vii : 12 ; xiv : 9-11 ; xx : 10. Please report accordingly.

But you say that if eternal punishment be true it is incredible that it should be threatened only nine times in the New Testament.

Sir, it is threatened a much larger number of times, though not by using *aion* or its derivatives. Every form of expression of which language is capable has been used, and it seems to me that the real reason why Luke and John did not use these words was because Inspiration directed otherwise,—knowing that the day would come when the force of these words would be denied. That Luke and John are not silent on that point, let the following texts prove : viz., Luke ix : 23-26 ; x : 12-16 ; xii : 4, 5, 10 ; xiii : 3, 5, 24-28 ; xvi : 22-26 ; xix : 26, 27 ; John iii : 3, 5, 14-16, 18, 36 ; v : 28, 29 ; viii : 24.

But, granting that eternal punishment were threatened "only nine times," I maintain that, were it threatened only *once*, it would be sufficient, until you could show it to be formally repealed by some subsequent utterance.

I maintain that, if a teacher should threaten an unruly scholar with expulsion from school, it would hardly be necessary for the threatening to be repeated more than *once* before it could be justly executed ; although that teacher might have all along multiplied expressions of love for the wayward scholar, and of a desire to win his affections.

You ask why Paul used this threatening only once in all his epistles.

He used *aionion* only once, but other forms of expression many times. He wrote fourteen epistles ; nine of these were to Churches he had established, or aided to establish ; four to individual Christians ; and one, Hebrews, to Jewish converts. Not one of them was addressed to unconverted persons ; therefore we should expect allusions to future punishment to be comparatively infrequent, for they would be found only whenever contrasts were drawn between the present life and the future, or in warnings against apostasy. And Paul's words on these points are neither few nor weak. See Rom. ii : 7, 12-16 ; vi : 22, 23 ; ix : 22, 23 ; xiv : 10, 12 ; 1 Cor. vi : 9-10 ; 2 Cor. ii : 16 ; v : 10 ; vi : 2, 17 ;

Gal. v : 19-21 ; vi : 6, 8 ; 1 Tim. iv : 8 ; Heb. v : 9 ; vi : 8, 9 ; ix : 27 ; x : 26, 27, 38, 39 ; xii : 14, 15. Similar remarks apply to, and similar quotations can be made from, the other epistles ; therefore, I see good reason to believe that Jesus, Peter and Paul were faithful preachers, more faithful than a class who are spoken of in Ezekiel, thirteenth chapter, which is recommended to your attention, particularly the twenty-second verse.

But you affirm that "the Bible is very explicit in the statement that God has purposed, promised and willed the salvation of all men," to prove which you give six references. (I really think you ought to give at least *nine*!)

Of these, one—Heb. vi : 13, is, I presume, a mistake, and I am unable to ascertain what you did intend. 1 Tim. i : 1-6, is also probably a mistake, but, as the corresponding verses of the next chapter contain a text that is often quoted by Universalists, I presume that was the chapter intended. This reference is concerning the will of God. The first chapter of Ephesians, to which you refer me, expresses something of the purposes and promises of God ; and the other references relate to the fullness of the provisions of the gospel plan of salvation.

As regards the fullness of the gospel promises, you know well that Orthodox Christians do not hold that any soul will be lost because he *cannot* be saved, but because he *will not*. The fact that ample provision has been made for the salvation of all, no more proves that all will avail themselves of it, than the fact that ample provision has been made to enable all the people of this town to attend church, proves that everybody does attend.

As regards the purposes and promises expressed in Ephesians i, recollect that these were addressed to converted persons, and intended solely for their comfort and encouragement ; or, if you think that the tenth and twenty-second verses mean more, let us connect them with 1 Tim. ii : 4, which is germane to them, and proceed to speak of this expression concerning the will of God.

The Greek words corresponding to "will have" are "*thelei sothein*," and mean simply "wishes or desires," and are commonly so translated in the New Testament ; e. g., Matt. xv : 28 ; xxiii : 37 ; Luke viii : 20, and other places. There is no authority for interpreting this verse as expressing God's absolute determination.

You remark that you "make no reliance upon *aion* or its deriv-

atives to prove the final redemption of the race." Allow me, then, to inquire what expressions in the New Testament you regard as teaching it? Let me also repeat my request that you answer the concluding question of my last letter.

2d. I wish to meet your argument concerning the force of the expression "unquenchable fire." You give me three Old Testament references to prove that this phrase cannot have the meaning I assign to it. Two of these, viz., Jer. xvii: 27; and Eze. xx: 45-48, any ordinary person would see at once spoke of a distinct work which the fire had to perform, and the sense is merely that the fire would not be quenched until that work was done. The others, viz., Isa. xxxiv: 8-10 is spoken of "the wicked," of "sinners in Zion," and of "hypocrites;" this chapter and the preceding one denounce God's judgments upon his enemies, and I am far from acknowledging, therefore, that they, (these fires,) have "long since ceased to burn." As to your reference in Mal. iii: 3, so long as it speaks of purifying fire, and not *penal* fire, it cannot be considered in point.

3d. You remark, "As to your large use of the Old Testament as evidence, I must set it all aside until you prove that it relates and refers to the life immortal;" and further on, "As to any revelations of the world to come, it is silent, if the New Testament be true."

On the 14th day of September, 1862, I heard you affirm, in one of your sermons, that mental philosophers granted that the Old Testament taught nothing of the immortality of the soul; and, on the 16th day of last April, I heard you again repeat your belief of the Old Testament's silence on this subject, but still saying that Moses probably did have a clear view of this truth.

(1.) My metaphysical reading is probably not so extensive as yours, for I have seen but three authors; sufficient, however, to prove some exceptions to your statement that mental philosophers grant that the Old Testament is silent concerning the soul's immortality, for every one of these declare the contrary.

(2.) I believe, (and probably have the same liberty to do so as you have to believe the contrary,) that the following passages in the Old Testament hint, at least, a future state: Job xiv: 14, (notice the word change,) xix: 25-27, xxi: 30; Ps. xvi: 9-11, xvii: 15, xxxvii: 28, xlix: 15, lxxiii: 24-26. cxvi: 15, cxl: 13;

Isa. xxv : 8, xxxiii : 16, 17, 21, 24, xxxv : 4-10, xl : 28-31, lvii : 1, 2 ; Dan. xii : 2, 3, and a fatiguing number besides.

(3.) If Moses had a clear view of the soul's immortality, how is it possible that he was for so many years the sole teacher of his nation, without imparting knowledge so important.

(4.) How shall we explain the accounts of those who professed to be able to communicate with the spirits of the dead ? See 1 Sam. xxviii chap ; Isa. viii : 19. These are practices which we cannot conceive to exist among a people who had no idea of the life immortal.

(5.) Let us examine a little of the New Testament evidence concerning Old Testament teaching. Heb. xi : 13-16. Read this plain and emphatic testimony that the ancient worthies "died in faith," "desiring a better country, that is an heavenly," "wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God," as if he would have been ashamed had they not acted in view of their immortality.

(6.) Yet once more. You are aware that in the time of Christ there were two Jewish sects, the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees believed in the soul's immortality and the resurrection ; (how did they learn it ?) the Sadducees did not. On a certain occasion they tried to puzzle Christ with a question on this subject. The story is told in Matt. xxii : 23-32. Notice Christ's answer to the Sadducees, "*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures !*" To what Scriptures did he refer ? Evidently the Old, for the New Testament was not then written. Is Christ's word that this doctrine was in the Old Testament any proof ?

4th. I proceed to examine what you represent to be the Bible conditions, (alias no conditions) of salvation. You give me twenty-one references, and with a consistency, designed, probably, for my imitation, eight of them are drawn from the Old Testament which you so lately ruled out of the argument as saying nothing concerning the life immortal !

I have examined all these texts carefully, and though I do find something about being punished "according to the fruit of one's doings," (Jer. xxi : 14,) and that the end and object of God's law is to convert the soul, (Ps. xix : 7,) which hints a little towards the conditions you call Orthodox ; though there is a great deal about the nature of Christ's mission, and the completeness of the atonement, all of which we acknowledge, (for you know that we

do not believe a single soul will be lost because he *could not* be saved,) and much more about the long-suffering mercy of God, and his desire and promise to bless every soul that will come to him ; I yet fail to find a single plain statement, either that there is no future punishment, or that the righteous and the wicked will be alike received to the joys of Heaven.

So much in general ; but there are some passages which you wish me to notice particularly.

(1.) "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," notice it is "the sin of the world." This phrase means no more than those other phrases, "Saviour of the world," "Redeemer of men," etc., and are only a way of saying that the provisions of the gospel are sufficient for all the world, but does not declare that all the world will avail themselves of the provisions so made, any more than the declaration that a certain clergyman was the chaplain of a regiment proves that every man in the regiment actually sought and received religious instruction from him.

(2.) You make two or three quotations which are rather noticeable ; they are Rom. II : 25-32 ; Heb. VIII : 10-13, and Jer. XXXI : 33, 34. The words from Romans are the concluding words of a very complete argument proving that the true descendants of Abraham, the true Israel, are those who are *his children by faith*, not his children *according to the flesh*." The words from Hebrews are simply the reference from Jeremiah quoted to illustrate and enforce a precisely similar argument ; but that the promises here made are to be fulfilled to the same people that are threatened with everlasting punishment in Matt. xxv : 46, I deny, and call on you to prove.

(3.) Jno. III : 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand ;" it says so in Ps. II : 8, and in Ps. II : 9 it tells what he will do with some of them, followed by some good advice, which we Orthodox think was intended to be followed.

(4.) Jno. III : 7, "Ye must be born again ;" you wish me to note that it says *must* instead of *may*. Why must we be born again ? Because Jesus says, in the third and fifth verses of the same chapter "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Sir, would the word *may* render this "Orthodox condition" more emphatic than it now is ?

(5.) Jno. VI : 37, "All that the Father giveth me *shall* come," not

may come, or have the offer of coming." A very small quibble. First prove to me that the phrase, "*All that the Father giveth me shall come*" means that *all mankind will come*. Again, if it *should* mean that *all mankind* have the offer of coming, who could find any reasonable fault?

(6.) Jno. v: 25, "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God "and they that hear shall live." No doubt. We believe in the resurrection, and we find something more about it in the twenty-ninth verse of this same chapter.

(7.) Jno. vi: 45, "They shall all be taught of God." Who? Turn to Isa. liv: 13, and find the quotation is from a chapter containing God's promise to believing Gentiles.

(8.) Luke xix: 10; Mark ii: 17 speak of Christ's mission, but do not prove that every sinner who is called to do so will repent; much less that those who do not will be saved all the same.

(9.) Jno. xii: 32, It seems plain that the *drawing* here spoken of is not *compulsion*. Christ declared that he will make clear the way and present full and sufficient inducements to all to forsake their evil ways. More than eighteen centuries have passed since those words were uttered and Christ was lifted up, and were this drawing compulsory we should expect that there would not now be found on earth a single enemy to him. Is this the case? I should infer from the nature of your references that you deny to man the power to act with any freedom of will, but shall base no argument upon the supposition until you inform me that such is the case.

(10.) Your quotation from Heb. ix: 26 does not read, "Sin shall be put away," but rather different; and the next verse, I will remark in passing, reads rather queerly; if the coming of Christ to judgment took place "about A. D. 70."

Twice you sneeringly ask, "Where are your celebrated conditions?" Sir, we believe the conditions of salvation to be, "Repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts xxx: 21) because and *only because the Bible says so* in more places than I have now time to enumerate.

You claim, sir, that you "preach repentance more emphatically, and believe in it more thoroughly" than do the Orthodox. Is there *any* sense in that statement? If so, what quarrel have you with us? It must be that somehow we do not insist upon repentance as strongly as we ought!

Either there *are* conditions in the offer of salvation or there *are not*; and if not, *nothing that a man can do, or say, or believe, can prevent his entrance into Heaven*. If there *are* conditions what do *you* say they are? If there *are none*, what can it matter to *you* what the Orthodox believe?

"When you can show that God," (Acts xvi: 31; Rom. ii, 5-9, 12-16, ix: 22, 23; 1 Cor. vi: 9; Gal. vi: 7, 8; Heb. vi: 8, 9, xii: 14; 1 Pet. iv: 17, 18; Rev. xxi: 18, xxii: 14, 15, etc.,) "his prophets," (Prov. i: 24-28, x: 28; Isa. iii: 10, 11; Dan. xii: 2, 3, etc.,) and "His only Son, our Saviour," (Matt. v: 20, vi: 15, x: 28, 32, 33, xii: 31, 32, xiii: 37-42, xxv: 46, xviii: 34, 35, xxvi: 24; Mark xvi: 16, etc.,) did *not* "mean what they said, and did *not* understand the subject of the soul's salvation and its immortal destiny, it will be time for *me* to consider" whether the Bible terms of salvation have *no* shade of reality; and whether by means of some compound metaphysical screw power your medley of texts, whole and fractional; may not be made to yield more than their apparent meaning.

Sir, we *should* "meet this subject as honest and dying persons, and meet it from the Bible, too, and remember there is no excuse for us if we deceive any person." It will fearfully compromise the demands of the undying soul, in front of its immortal destiny," to build its eternal hopes upon a foundation of sand.

Let us ever strive, realizing that the eye of the heart-searching God is upon us, to search for truth in sincerity of soul, and fear to "handle the Word of God deceitfully."

Sincerely yours,

L. A. PROUTY.

NOTE.—I have not seen the numerous authors, ancient and modern, to which you refer me. I have none of the books. But let us remember the first article of our agreement.

L. A. P.

NEGATIVE.

CHESTER, VT., Aug. 19th, 1869.

MISS PROUTY—*Madam*.:—Yours of the 30th ult. is before me and considered.

You appear to be quite an adept in the science of criticism. You enjoy quibbling about preliminaries, with a keen relish; you seem to compel the reader to acknowledge *you* a master workman in the manufacture of hobbies. And all who read your support of the affirmative must acknowledge you mistress in the school of hobby-riding.

You talk of commencing with *candor* as if it were a splendid virtue, and then you descend very rapidly to the terrible deep of low comment. This is going with a superlative sweep from the sublime to the ridiculous; and this, too, in the so-called argument to support the awful doctrine of endless misery.

You speak again and again of being serious, as if seriousness were a priceless quality; and then *comment* on the greatest of all subjects—the soul's final destiny, as if it were a burlesque.

We come now to your "begging the question,"—*petitio principii*.

In the beginning you selected the question, "Does the Bible teach the endless punishment of any of our race?" You agreed to defend the affirmative, and the logicians say, that begging the question is "the assuming of a principle which amounts to the thing to be proved."

This you did in the beginning. You presented no argument in support of your question. As proof of the truth of your proposition, you simply referred to *one text*, viz., 1 Thess. 1 : 7-10.

Again, the last clause of the logicians' definition of "begging the question" is "slightly disguising the act by a variation of words so as to win your opponent's consent." And this you have also done, in assuming the negative and neglecting to support the affirmative, "slightly disguising the act by a variation of words so as to win your opponent's consent." You slightly disguised the fact of assuming the question true, and only tried to prove my argument false. The reader can see at once that you have, to the fullest extent, "begged the question." And yet you say, "this I have not done." Verily, all that is needed is to give you rope enough, and you will build your own scaffold and hang yourself.

Perhaps the reader, at this point, will think your case is severe enough without burying you under the rubbish of your own scaffold.

But again, says Bishop Whately (an Orthodox divine) in his *Elements of Logic* :

"Obliquity and disguise being, of course, most important to the success of the *petitio principii*—'begging the question'—as well as of other fallacies, the sophist will, in general, have recourse to the circle, or else not venture to state distinctly his assumption of the point in question; or will rather assert some other proposition which implies it."

This you have done in your pretended argument. You assumed a proposition, not the very same as the question, but unfairly implying it, by disputing the negative. And you have "not ventured to state," in argument, "distinctly your assumption of the point in question," (that is to sustain the affirmative) but have asserted some other propositions, (viz., that my argument was not pertinent or scriptural,) "which implies it."

Again. Bishop Whately says, under the head of "Fallacy of references," page 189 (see his work:) "One of the many contrivances, employed for this purpose, is what may be called the 'fallacy of references,' which is particularly common in popular theological works. It is, of course, a circumstance which adds great weight to an assertion, that it shall seem to be supported by many passages of Scripture. Now, when a writer can find few or none of these that distinctly and decidedly favor his opinion, he may, at least, find many which may be conceived capable of being so understood, or which, in some way or other, remotely relate to the subject; but, if these texts were inserted at length, it would be at once perceived how little they bear on the question. The usual artifice, therefore, is to give merely references to them,—trusting that nineteen out of every twenty readers will never take the trouble of turning to the passages; but, taking for granted that they afford, each, some degree of confirmation to what is maintained, will be over-awed by seeing every assertion supported, as they suppose, by five or six texts of Scripture."

How perfectly have you fitted the Orthodox Whately's definition of a sophist, in your argument; and how superlatively does your

method of argument and quotation fill his definition of "Fallacy of reference!"

Query. Would you like a little more Orthodox logic?

I had purposed in the beginning not to notice your Quixotic criticism, but to allow your flings to go by as straws in the wind, indicating to the reader the condition of your heart and mind, when dealing with this most awful of all subjects—*endless misery*. But as you make *cant* your fort, *quibble* your army, and *criticism* your largest gun, and persistently cling to these in your every communication, you have compelled me (in this letter, which must close this discussion) to meet you in your Fort.

When urged by you to this discussion, I felt assured that, in some degree, you realized the "awful subject of the supposed endless misery!" and felt something of the great responsibility to God, and Christ, and humanity in its defence. But to find you in every communication full of catches, sharply hunting for thrusts, making sarcasm your supreme effort, forces the reader into great doubt whether you believe the affirmative of the question under discussion. And yet, all this is in keeping with your statement in town, "that if you could not convince Mr. Foster in the defence of your question, you would get some fun out of it."

Now if you are attempting to argue the imaginary endless misery for "the fun you will get out of it," it shows at once, that you either do not believe it, or that you are something else than an honest professor in Christ.

I am exceedingly sorry, that in so solemn a subject as the soul's final destiny, you should make sarcasm your fort, and use invective in your defence, and so oblige me to meet you in such a place. I feel hurt to be obliged to do this, but our suffering community demand it. So much for your fort, and your tenacious love of its defence.

It is not necessary here to answer again your reference to Adam Clark, for the reader will see at once that Adam Clark was not referred to as explaining 2 Thes. 1: 7-10 as do Universalists, but as explaining the second coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem; and then I affirmed that this Epistle to Thessalonians was written just before that event and referred to that subject; then I referred you to the Orthodox divines, Drs. Hammond, Gill and Cappe, who explained 2 Thess. 1: 7-10 just as do all Universalists.

Now, if you can show other Orthodox divines who explain 2 Thess. 1: 7-10 differently, you show your house of faith to be divided against itself, and according to Jesus' criterion, it cannot stand.

Again, when we explain your most difficult texts as having no reference to your favorite creed of endless misery, and bring your best scholars as explaining these texts in the same way, then you say, you "beg to differ from them." And so your argument amounts to nothing, as it lacks agreement with your standard authors.

Now your admission that Adam Clark's explanation about the second coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70, is in agreement with Universalists, is positive proof from yourself, that I was right as I used him, though you try to "slightly disguise the fact by a variation of words," as says your Orthodox Whately.

I have nothing to do with commentators who explain any text as you desire them to do, (and to whom you refer me) for my business is with the *truth* and *teaching* of the text, sustained by other scripture. When some of your best Orthodox commentators explain the texts you think undoubted proof of endless misery as do all Universalists, it makes conclusive proof that *endless misery* is not taught in them. I know this fact tries many earnest souls asking for evidence to support endless punishment; and it is trying you, as *you* flutter like a bird with a broken wing.

We come now to your misrepresentations, which you attempt to smooth over with consummate sophistry.

In yours of July 2d, you accuse me of saying that, "because the thing revealed is beyond our knowledge, therefore it cannot be true," and in your last of July 30th, you say you did not mean *me* personally, but all Universalists as a body; and then add that you will "*now* deliberately re-affirm the palpable truth." And then you give for evidence this, viz., "A very common argument among those of your faith" is the question, "Can you understand how such a thing can be true?" According to your logic, you think this question the same as saying, "because the thing revealed is beyond our knowledge, therefore it cannot be true."

Again, you bring forward the Townshend lady who said "She would not believe what she could not understand;" this you think

is the same as saying, "because the thing revealed is beyond our knowledge, therefore it cannot be true." Here your reasoning is fallacious. There is no parallel between the statements.

We come once more to "*aionion*." You claim to have the advantage of me in the "acquaintance with Universalists, both living and dead," concerning this word "*aionios*." This is the great climax of your assumptions, and makes your claim to be considered a sophist (according to Dr. Whately's definition) perfect.

By the same meaning, spirit and assumption, you claim to have the advantage of Holy Writ.

You refer to Rev. T. S. King as "distributing the meaning of *aionios*,"—that he renders it indefinitely when joined with the wicked; but gives it as meaning *endless* when joined with the *righteous*.

I am sorry that you should attempt to misrepresent the gifted and lamented King, for no one acquainted with his writings or preaching would do it, I am sure. Please read his two sermons in reply to Dr. Adams, published by Crosby, Nichols & Co., in 1858.

I must necessarily infer that the other MSS. to which you refer are misrepresented.

Please read Dr. Tholuck, Prof. Stewart, Isaac Taylor, Arch-Bishop Tillotson, Wm. Law, Dr. Thomas Burnett and Henry Moore, on this same "*aionios*" as connected with punishment. Read Origen, whose native tongue was Greek, and who threatened sinners with "*aionios*" punishment, and yet preached Universal salvation A. D. 185. Consult the Sibylline Oracles, which speak in the same way of the "*aionios*" or everlasting punishment of sinners, and yet affirm that they will be saved.

Gregory of Nyssa, who believed in the restoration of all the wicked, declares that sinners are to be restored by means of everlasting or "*aionios*" punishment.

This descriptive and qualifying word *aionios*, rendered everlasting, is an adjective under the government of a substantive, as a possession, and in its length and breadth of meaning is controlled by the elements of the substantive. The word punishment owns and controls the word *aionios* or everlasting; and so it is in all instances of its use as an adjective.

That I am right is evident from Scripture, viz.: That the word everlasting in Gen. xvii : 7, 8, is joined with "covenant" and "possession," both of which ceased eighteen hundred years ago. In Ex. xl : 15, Aaron's priesthood was called "an everlasting priesthood," and yet it ceased when Christ came. In Ps. xxiv : 7 it is joined with "doors." In Hab. iii : 6, it says "the everlasting mountains were scattered," and the words *forever* and *eternal* are from the same *aionios*. And in Jonah ii, 6 it says, "The earth with her bars was about me *forever*;" and according to the account it was just *three days* and *three nights*.

And this *aionios* is from the Hebrew word *olam* (we are told,) having the same signification. Hence it is evident, that these words all from *aionios*, have a Bible definition which is determined by the word or subject to which they are joined. When joined with anything of limited duration, they are *limited* in meaning; and when joined with anything of endless duration, they have an *endless* meaning. Now the word *everlasting*, joined with punishment, is limited, in its meaning, as punishment has a *limited* meaning from its very nature. The moment you make punishment *endless*, it ceases to be *punishment*, and becomes *revenge*. As regards that same word applied to life, in Matt. xxv : 46, it is simply in contrast to the punishment, as *both* were in *this world*, on the *earthly side* of the *resurrection*. Each party received its deserts without passing into death or the resurrection. And in *both cases*, it was on the ground of *works* wholly, which *fact* precludes the text, Matt. xxv : 46 from *any connection* with the *final salvation* by Christ.

Again, Dr. Joseph Priestly (an Orthodox Doctor) discusses the meaning of *aionion*, here in Matt. xxv : 46, in connection with "future punishment," and he learnedly argues the insufficiency of the word *aionios* to prove its endlessness, and shows that its duration is limited by the very word rendered *punishment*.

Dr. Robinson (an Orthodox D. D.) defines the word in the same way in his English-Greek lexicon.

Now when you leave all scholarship and your own best Orthodox divines, and assert another meaning, what credit can you claim ?

And when you make the adjective and descriptive term *aionios*, a substantive, controlling all that follows, you break the rules of

criticism, destroy the meaning of the author, and make eternal things hang on the fallibility of an ambiguous word.

That I am right, please see your Orthodox Donnegan, Parkhurst, Dr. McKnight and Simpson's Essays. I have been lengthy here and somewhat explicit, because of your assumed "acquaintance with the living and dead," and your wilfulness to misrepresent, and (as Bishop Whately says,) "slightly disguising the act by a variation of words, so as to win your opponent's consent."

Yours of July 2d, says: "It is left for inferential preachers of Universalism, in the noon of the nineteenth century, to speak, &c." Over this I will throw the veil of charity, as our pens do not always do the bidding of the intellect.

We believe and preach that repentance is an absolute necessity; that it is the stopping place in the road of sin—the remembering and turning. *Remembering* and *turning* is the true significance of the word, "*metanoia*," rendered repentance. And this signification is fully set forth in the practical life of the prodigal son, in his leaving the life of sin and entering on the road which led to his father's house.

That *all will repent*, or *remember* and *turn*, which must be from sin, is evident from the following Scripture, viz., Heb. viii: 11, 12: "And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for *all shall know me*, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." And the possession of this knowledge puts a person into the eternal life. John xvii: 3, "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Isa. xlv: 23, "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear;" 24th verse, "Shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." John vi: 45, "And they shall all be taught of God." Ps. xxii: 27, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." This is universal repentance.

Repentance in no way clears a person from the consequences of sin. And yet, all must (or "shall remember and turn") repent; and must be "born again." John iii: 7.

Notice, it does not say, *have the offer* of knowing God, but "*shall know him.*" Isa. XLV : 27. It does not say, they *have the offer* of having righteousness and strength in the Lord, but "every tongue *shall swear*; surely shall say in the Lord *have I* righteousness and strength." Again. It does not say, *have the offer* of being born again, but "*ye must be born again.*"

These are only three of the Bible conditions of salvation, among the great number; but how infinitely different from the Orthodox "offers of salvation," and "terms of salvation!"

That repentance can in no way clear a person from the result of sin, is evident from Prov. XI : 21 : "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished; but the seed of the righteous shall be delivered." 1 Cor. III : 8, "Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one; and every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor." Col. III : 25, "But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done; and there is no respect of persons." Ex. XXXIV : 7, "Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation."

All the teachings of the Bible are in keeping with the above texts. Strange offers of escape! And yet, Orthodoxy preaches, continually that ye *can escape* the consequences of sin by a *conditional salvation*—by repentance.

Orthodoxy is continually preaching to all men just as the serpent preached to Eve, in the garden, that "ye shall not surely die," (Gen. III : 4,) because of conditional escape; while the Bible and every Universalist is preaching, "Ye shall receive in body according to that ye have done, whether good or bad." 2 Cor. V : 10.

It is very strange that the first Universalist sermon ever preached was preached by God to Eve in the garden; and was, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." And the first Orthodox sermon was preached by Satan to Eve in the same garden: "Ye shall not surely die," if ye will accept the offers of salvation, if ye will repent, if ye will get religion.

It is now evident to all who read this work that we believe most fully in the complete reward for all sin; and beyond this is reconciliation and peace, both of which must come through the Saviour.

And we sincerely believe that the preaching of endless punishment and its terms of salvation is the most pernicious of all errors, and is virtually a premium on sin. It says to the blackest of criminals, the pirate and murderer, no matter how guilty you may be; if you will repent, you will escape all the consequences of sin, escape endless punishment, and go to heaven. It gives all to understand that there is little or no punishment for sin in this world; that there is here no judgment, but that judgment and punishment are in eternity; and that, at any time, if a person will repent, accept the offers of salvation, or get religion, he will escape the eternal hell, and gain heaven.

On this ground, the murderer of Mrs. Griswold (an aged, and according to Orthodoxy, an unconverted woman) of Williston, Vt., who was hung at Windsor, last March, claimed that his sins were forgiven, and that he had escaped hell, and was going from the gallows to Jesus, and to heaven; while the poor, good old lady whom he murdered has gone to endless punishment,—that is, if Orthodoxy is true. And, in the New-York State Prison, last February, a man was hung who made similar claims to conversion, and declared that he could see the angels coming to take his soul to Christ and heaven; while the little girl whom he violated and then murdered went down to the woes of endless torture! I leave this fruit of this system without a comment.

You next assume "eternal punishment true," and then hobble around it on the crutches of quotations,—giving a long list,—the whole of which I turn over to your Orthodox Whately, who calls them the "fallacy of references."

In this same way, I might assert my belief, and fasten it *on paper* to the Bible, and send it to you; but it would be no argument; it would be but a fallacious method.

To the scholar, it will at once be plain, that, according to my showing, and from others' testimony, wherever the words, *everlasting*, *forever and ever*, and *eternal*, occur in the Bible, they are from one word in the original, that is *aionios*, and all passages containing them are answered by my remarks on that word. And the remarks, with the evidence from your Orthodox scholars, sweep away every thing you or any one can advance on the supposed "endless misery;" though my argument and evidence could easily be given.

Your assertion that "not one of your scholars" addressed to

UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL LIBRARY
CRANE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
TUFTS UNIVERSITY
MEDFORD 55, MASSACHUSETTS

unconverted persons," crumbles to ruins before these two texts: viz., 1 Cor. xv : 12, 34, "Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" "Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame." And these are but two among many of the same class. And his doctrine and argument for the final redemption is overwhelming proof that all your statements, and especially your quotations in support of them, are fallacious.

You assume not to see the pertinence of my declaration that the Bible is very explicit in its statements that God has *purposed*, *promised* and *willed* the salvation of all men. But I will here advance further: God purposes the salvation of all men: Eph. 1 : 9, 10, "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath *purposed in himself*:" "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one *all things in Christ*, both which are in heaven, and which are on the earth, *even in him*."

What do the words "All things which are in heaven and on earth" signify? Prof. Stuart, the highest Orthodox authority, says they mean the universe; and in exact accordance with this definition, Archbishop Newcomb (an Orthodox D. D.) says they signify all intelligent beings.

And that his purpose will be accomplished is evident from the following: Isa. xiv : 24, 27, "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand;" "For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" God, then, hath a purpose in creating mankind, and that purpose will be executed, letter and spirit.

God promised Abraham to bless all mankind, viz., Gen. xii : 3, "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." And xxii : 18, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." And this reaffirmed in Heb. vi : 13, 14, ("For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself," "Saying, surely blessing I will bless thee; and multiplying I will multiply thee.") All families—all nations—*shall*, not *may*, be blessed. Strange promise, if endless punishment is true for one human being!

And in 1 Tim. ii : 4, God has willed the salvation of all men ; and in the first and second verses he commands us to pray for the salvation of all men ; and in the eighth verse, we are to pray in faith without wrath or doubting.

Now, when you pray for the salvation of all men, do you pray in *faith* and without *doubting* ? then you are a Universalist. But if you pray for the salvation of all men, and *doubt* the salvation of *all men*, you do not pray *in faith*. And in Rom. xiv : 23, " And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith : for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Your condition is fully stated by inspiration.

You cannot pray for the endless punishment of a single soul.

Oh ! what a horrible condition to be in,—to be commanded to pray for the salvation of *all* by God, and to pray *in faith*, nothing doubting, and then *believe* and *argue* the *endless misery* of some of our race !

Again, *you* and every righteous person of every denomination, now on the earth, and all such that have ever lived, have been and are praying for the salvation of all men, literally praying for *my doctrine* to be *true*, and yours false. Does Universalism *stand* on a sandy foundation ? And when God says, "he hears the prayers of the righteous," Prov. xv : 29, "and the desire of the righteous shall be granted ;" x : 24, *how then stands final redemption* ?

Oh ! give me a *faith* I can *pray* for, and *believe* for, and *preach* for, and be *spent* for, and how else can I be but in Christ ?

Consistency is said to be a jewel ; then, if you believe endless punishment, *pray for it*, and stop your prayers for the salvation of all men.

You ask on what words I rely in the New Testament for immortality, if I reject *aionios*. I answer on the Greek "*anastasis ton nekron*," meaning the resurrection of the dead, 1 Cor. xv : 42. And Jesus speaking of that state says, "There they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." And "because I live" (that is—Heb. vii : 16—after the power of an endless life) "they shall live also," John xiv : 19. "And they can die no more, and shall be children of the resurrection," Luke xx : 36. And Paul says, "If this earthly house of our tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands *eternal* in the heavens, and that fadeth not away. This

mortal *must* put on immortality, and this corruptible *must put on incorruption*, and the earthly shall bear the heavenly image." Strange conditions, if endless punishment be true!

And further, in all our Saviour's, and in all of Paul's descriptions of the resurrection state, we have no description of *two classes*, no representations of two conditions, though he was preaching directly to the boldest of infidels and to those who afterward murdered him, as mentioned in Luke xx : 38.

And Jesus makes no affirmation that *the resurrection or life immortal* is to be *according to any professions or works in this world*. And in all of them (where "*anastasis ton nekron*" occurs) there is no intimation that there is *there* any *separation*, or that there is in that world *another ordeal* for man to pass. Strange conditions, if the Orthodox *terms* of salvation, the general judgment, and endless punishment are true!

Your argument, again, on the "unquenchable fire" needs no reply here, for you admit enough to destroy all you have said in your previous letters.

As to the Old Testament's teaching a future life, you again assume this true, as you have endless punishment, which as your logicians say is *begging the question*—"slightly disguising the act by a variation of words so as to win your opponent's consent." Then you bring forward a long list of quotations, which your logicians say are "fallacious references," and these you say "hint the immortal life."

Any common reader can see how utterly unable you are here to sustain yourself.

And with what crushing force comes the text, 2 Tim. i : 9, 10, 11, "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel; Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles."

This tenth verse cannot be true if the old testament teaches the doctrine of immortality.

The quotation of the New Testament proves nothing in the direction which you assert. You might as well say the New Testa-

ment refers to Judaism, therefore Judaism is immortal. No, the question was asked by Job, and it stood unanswered two thousand years,—“If a man die shall he live again?” and it was not answered till Christ came, and then emphatically he says, “Thy brother shall rise again.”

The faith in which the old prophets died was the faith of a *coming* Messiah, who should deliver Israel, and give them *Canaan* for an everlasting possession.

The affirmation that “God is not the God of the dead but of the living,” Matt. xxii : 32, referring to Moses and Isaac, is simply a proof of the resurrection four hundred years after the Old Testament. Inferences and suppositions amount to nothing in proof of Old Testament teachings.

The sermons you speak of hearing, contain the written words,—“We *infer* from the language of Moses, that he believed in another life, and yet there is no *proof positive* that the Old Testament teaches immortal life.”

Then again, “mental philosophers,” was not the term used, but “the best philosophers now hold that the Old Testament is silent about the resurrection life.”

You talk about the Pharisees believing in the resurrection, and represent that they obtained this belief from the Old Testament, whereas the Jews had been in contact with the Egyptians (who were heathen) for four hundred and twenty years between the Old Testament and New Testament, and of the Egyptians they *learned* the belief in immortality, and *learned* the *heathen doctrines* of a *personal devil*, *original sin*, *miraculous conversion*, *total depravity*, and *endless punishment*. And what did Christ say of these doctrines? Matt. xvr : 12, “Beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

The doctrine of the Sadducees was infidelity—the denial of future life. The doctrine of the Essēnes (the other division of the Jews,) was that of the final restoration, the salvation of all men. But Christ nowhere warns any one to beware of this doctrine. How strange—how unaccountable, if the Pharisees’ doctrine of endless punishment is true!

You attempt to answer the Bible conditions of salvation, where it says, “taketh away the sin of the world,” and “ye must be born again;” by saying, “Why must they be born again?” which

is adding to the text and bringing you into the severest condemnation of the scriptures' You annex the word "why" and make a question of the immutable decree of God.

And the text, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me,"—it says "*shall* come," not *may* come,—you answer by saying, "a very small quibble." Let the reader judge who quibbles.

And your reply to the text, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me," will convince any reader, (I verily believe,) that you have no more ability to touch its truth—its universalism—than you have to make a world.

I think if you will commit to memory this text, Ezek. xiii : 22, "Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life," you will be enabled to see the strength of your argument.

You ask for the Bible condition of salvation? The Bible answers in certainty of punishment. Prov. xi : 21, "The wicked shall not be unpunished." 1 Cor. iii : 8, "Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one; and every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor." Col. iii : 25, "But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons." These are only three among an immense number of the same kind.

Where are they punished? The Bible answers: Prov. xi : 3, "The wicked and sinner shall be recompensed in the earth." Ezek. xxi : 30, "I will judge thee in the place where thou wast created, and in the land of thy nativity." Jeremiah xxiii : 5, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth."

When are they punished? The Bible answers: Ezek. iii : 16, 17, It is said to be "under the sun." 1 Chron. xvi : 14, it is "on the earth." Matt. xii : 20, it is declared that Christ is to "send forth judgment unto victory in the gospel day."

What will be the effect of punishment and the condition of the wicked beyond? The Bible answers: Job v : 17, 18, "Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth; therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty; For he maketh sore, and bindeth

up; he woundeth, and his hands make whole." Heb. xii: 8, 9, 10, 11, "But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then ye are bastards and not sons. Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." Strange language if endless punishment is true! Can there be an "*afterwards*" to endless punishment.

Indeed, beyond all that can be gathered as evidence of everlasting punishment, beyond the "burning of root and branch" of the wicked; beyond the "smoke of the torment which ascendeth for ever and ever—yes, beyond all this, God says, Isa. lvii: 16, "He will not contend forever, neither will he be always wroth." And in Lam. iii: 32, "That he will have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies." Isa. xlix: 15, "And though a mother forget her child, yet I will not forget thee."

And beyond all the punishments and afflictions of the wicked, He still declares, 1 John iv: 8, "He is love;" and in James i: 17, "That with him there is no variableness or shadow of turning."

After God says he will "punish them according to the fruit of their doings;" Jere, xxi: 14. He says, Psalms xxii: 27, "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord," and "all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." By Paul—God says, Heb. viii: 10, "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people;" and, in the eleventh verse, "for all shall know me from the least to the greatest." I am glad to see you, in one place, quote some Bible conditions in Acts xx: 21, for these are Universalist conditions.

The special Bible terms from our blessed Saviour, are these, viz. Luke iv: 18, 19, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them

that are bruised." Here Jesus, fully sets forth his mission and its universality and extent.

John viii: 32. "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free; and read the thirty-seventh verse, and you see he said it to his murderers. John x: 16. "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold, *them* also I *must bring*, and *they shall hear my voice*; and there shall be *one fold* and *one shepherd*." Here is the same "*must*" condition.

And then the parables of the lost sheep, and the lost piece of silver, mentioned in Luke xv: 8, fully teach the extent of the searching power.

The sheep, though lost, belonged to the owner, and was a sheep still. And the shepherd sought till he found it; and when found he asked no questions—how he wandered; nor did he ask any of the celebrated questions of Orthodoxy—"if he felt that God would be just to damn him to endless punishment for his sin?" Neither did he require the sheep to answer any question, or do anything. No, he took up the sheep, whether he was willing or not, and took him back.

And the same truth is taught in connection with the lost piece of silver; and we believe and contend that all other teachings of the Bible are in harmony with these and other similar parables.

These are only a very, *very* small number of evidences among the immense amount, which teach the universality of Christ's mission, and the Bible terms of salvation. But how superlatively strange are these conditions, if your Orthodox conditions and endless punishment are true!

You ask if I "recollect that a very respectable number of the first scholars the world has seen have been and are found in the ranks of the Orthodox believers?" What a question to bring forward to prove the truth of endless punishment! Please remember that some of the best scholars the world has ever seen have been and are found among the Jews, the Brahmins, Chinese and Roman Catholics! Again, many of the best scholars the world has seen in every age have rejected and are rejecting the supposed endless misery.

Then again, if you will read the history of this doctrine, you will find that it originated among the heathen, and you can trace its origin to them as easily and clearly as you can trace our system

of astronomy to Copernicus. And if you will acquaint yourself with its effects on the human family, from its origin to the present, you will reject it as sarcastically as you now try to support it. You certainly show a zeal worthy of a better cause.

You mention three young men, educated at Chester Academy and Middlebury College, who became Orthodox ministers, and made affirmation in your church that they were from Universalist families and converted by reading Greek. And then you ask if I can show any such in our ranks?

Answer: Solomon Laws was so converted to Universalism at Dartmouth College, and Rev. J. Morse, now of Hanover, N. H., Rev. T. L. Dean, of Haverhill, Mass., and so many others, that I do not know of one minister among us who was not thus converted.

And we have many among us converted from the Congregational, Baptist and Methodist denominations, on this very ground. One of your ablest preachers in this State, Rev. C. W. Emerson, of Northfield, Vt., was converted some two years ago. I am myself a converted man, and laboring for man's redemption in Christ, and all on the same ground. Rev. Dr. Clapp, a celebrated divine for thirty years, of New Orleans, was educated at Yale College, and by deep study of Greek and human nature, was fully converted to Universalism. See his biography.

Prof. Alpheus Crosby, Greek professor at Dartmouth College, for a long term of years, was brought up and educated, and converted, as he thought, in the Congregational Church, but after long years of deep study in the Greek, Latin and Hebrew, he became converted to Universalism, and when he became fully convinced, he told the other faculty of the college, and shortly after he was turned out of Dartmouth. And the President and Dr. Crosby, of the Medical School, and an Orthodox member too, told me that the turning away of Prof. Crosby was the greatest mistake Dartmouth ever made, for there was no Greek scholar in America equal to him. He is the author of Crosby's Greek Grammar, used by most colleges, and is living at Cambridge, Mass., and is the first proof-reader, of all Greek manuscript, in New England. Please see his work entitled "Second Advent."

I could write all day in giving you like instances. Very strange, if *aionios* punishment means endless punishment. And Oh! how astonishing, if the *Orthodox terms* of salvation are true!

Again, if endless punishment (so-called) is true, what will you do with certain Universalist members which you have in the Congregational and Baptist churches in this town?

Now look at this awful heathen doctrine in its effects upon your most learned. The late Prof. Stuart, of Andover, in an article published in 1840, speaks of the distress which the doctrine of eternal punishment inflicts "upon the great mass of thinking christians," using this language, viz :

"It would seem to be from such considerations that a belief in a future repentance and recovery of sinners has become so wide spread in Germany, pervading even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and evangelical men in respect to most or all of what is called Orthodox doctrine, saving the point before us.

The Orthodox Doctor and Professor Tholuck says, "The scripture phrases concerning punishment do not shut out mercy from the future world." Mr. Isaac Taylor, whose learning and Orthodoxy will not be questioned, says on the word *aionios* connected with life, "That the life must not be made to hinge on the force of the adjective employed." Sir Isaac Newton questioned the truth of endless punishment. Dr. Doddridge was uncertain about it. Even Dr. Watts, who has written the most awful hymns about hell, came to believe that a penitent soul might be saved hereafter from its terrors. Dr. Paley was suspicious of the doctrine. Mr. and Mrs. Barbauld entirely rejected it. Dr. Johnson, (a truly great man,) whose reverence for the Scriptures was most solemn, confessed that "The passages that speak of eternal punishment admit of a mitigated interpretation."

The Orthodox Dr. Abraham Tucker said "the Greek words by which the doctrine is chiefly defended are strained beyond what they will bear in the service." Dr. McKnight, the celebrated Orthodox commentator on the epistles, says, "I must be so candid as to acknowledge that the use of the terms eternity, everlasting, forever, in other passages of scripture, shows that they who understand these words in a limited sense when applied to punishment, put no forced interpretation on them." Rev. John Foster, of England, the profoundest intellect of this century, among the Baptists, threw off the belief in the perpetuity of punishment. Prof. Maurice, of the English Episcopal Church, and one of the most learned and respected of her clergy, denies that Matt. xxv : 46 shuts out all

hope for the wicked. Mr. Carlyle, of the English Episcopal Church, says: "I am satisfied that no intelligent clergyman among us embraces endless punishment;" and adds, it is certain that the Greek word *aionios* which is sometimes applied to punishment in the gospel, does not prove its eternity."

Now friend, will you tell me how much more evidence you need to bring the focal light of the glorious gospel fully into your heart and life?

But again, look for a moment at the woe and misery this awful dogma has sent creeping through all the crevices of humanity in the hearts and spirits of its ablest and best professors. Says Dr. Albert Barnes, in speaking of the supposed endless punishment, "before it I am struck dumb; it is all dark, dark, dark to my soul, and I cannot disguise it." But it does not seem to trouble you.

Dr. Edward Beecher says of all the accepted systems of Orthodoxy, "Every one of these theories involves God and his whole administration and his eternal kingdom in the deepest dishonor that the mind of man or angel can conceive, by the violation of the highest and the most sacred principles of honor and right, and that on the scale of infinity and eternity."

Look over the register of your denominational clergy, and see the vast numbers who have come (in the last twenty-five years only) to reject your favorite endless punishment. I could write you for months on this very point, and not exhaust the evidence out of your own denomination against you and all your argument.

Your question, asked in July 2d, 1869, and asked again in yours of July 30th, and which, without intending to slight you, I passed as unimportant, I will now answer.

You ask, "Suppose the Bible does not teach eternal punishment, and suppose God should send us a new revelation, in which he intended to teach it, will you just suggest some phrase, either in Greek or English, which shall express the idea plainly and fully, so that no one could misunderstand it?"

Answer. Those who die in an unconverted state—the wicked,—*apeleusontai, outoi eis kolasin akataluton. Oi de dikaioi eis zoen akataluton*,—rendered: these shall go away into *endless punishment*, but the righteous (those converted in this world) into *life endless*. This would make it definite and clear.

Hoping that you will attend to all this prayerfully, with a loving

spirit for truth, and that you will see the truth, and accept it in Christ, and be free; and hoping that you will accept, in the spirit of Christ, the plainness, directness and sharpness which you have forced out of me, contrary to all my desires,

I subscribe myself yours sincerely,

In the great faith of Final Redemption,

E. S. FOSTER.

CHESTER, VT., Sept. 9, 1869.

Madam.—I have been unable to complete the answer to your last till this day. My time is so completely absorbed in parish duties and my health so infirm, I cannot do as I would.

With this letter, the discussion must be closed. If you are not satisfied now that you are in an error, you must certainly cast off a large portion of your own best Orthodox divines.

Again, I am unwilling to go any further with a discussion conducted in the spirit and language presented, and the spirit required in me to answer you.

I know you boast of holding two discussions with other Universalist ministers, and that you vanquished them, for they withdrew; and I have learned, from absolute evidence, that they were so disgusted with the method pursued, that they would not have any thing to do with it. And your first letters presented the same to me; and, if it had not been for the repeated earnest entreaties of many noble and devoted spirits in this town, and for the cause of truth and redemption, I should have never entered on the discussion.

I am sorry that one professing Christ, in any form, should have even a disposition to push a discussion in the spirit and language presented; and I should certainly suppose that you had long since learned the proverb, that "They who live in glass houses should never throw stones."

I ask you, as a friend, as one who would respect you for Christ's sake, to be contented with this closing. You placed me on the negative, and the negative must close it. Let the community judge between us. Truth will stand regardless of you and me.

And the only questions now remaining are these: viz., "How and when will you have this published? Will you pay one half for the publication?"

I will say here, your letters and discussions have fully converted Mr. and Mrs. P., (I think) to the great redemption.

I think the inhabitants of Chester will be fully satisfied that you and I have no further discussion. Now my prayer is, may the good Father bless you abundantly in life, health, and Faith in Christ. HERE THE DISCUSSION ENDS.

I remain truly yours in the Gospel,
E. S. FOSTER.

MISS PROUTY'S REPLY TO THE FOREGOING DEBATE.

CHESTER, VT., Sept. 15th, 1869.

REV. E. S. FOSTER—*Sir*:—Yours dated Aug. 19th, to which is appended a note dated Sept. 9th, was received on the 11th instant.

In the body of your letter, and also in the note, you desire, or rather command, the discussion to cease with your letter. I refuse, for reasons which follow:

1st. The communication now before me contains some misrepresentations.

2d. I am not accustomed to leave anything unfinished if I can avoid it, and shall not consent to do so now, especially when I have designs of further scope than merely to convince you that there exists one believer in Orthodoxy having sufficient *courage* to meet you in its defence.

3d. I deny the right of the negative to *dictate when the discussion shall close*. In all courts the plaintiff has the closing plea. In all parliamentary bodies, discussion ceases by mutual consent, or agreeably to rules previously established by the majority. Besides this, a familiar discussion between two persons is not supposed to be bound by any rules other than exist by agreement of parties.

4. You agreed at the beginning to discuss *two questions* with me, and we have not yet finished the *first one*.

The first reason you gave for wishing the discussion to cease, was a good one, and might have influenced me were it not for what I have mentioned in my 1st and 2d, or if you had not added your next. I know how pleasant it is to be actively useful, and I hope these privileges will long be yours; but, sir, if you will inform yourself in regard to *my* present condition, you will find that your time and strength are probably equal to *mine*. Your disgust at my

style is a poor reason to urge, when you admit that *you knew what it was from the first*.

Your note informs me that, by means of my letters and discussion, two persons whom you name, have been, you think, "*fully converted to the cause of the great redemption.*" By this I suppose you mean that they have been converted to Universalism.

If this be true, you can afford to keep me at work ; perhaps I might make as many such converts as yourself ! But there is probably some mistake about the *lady*. I have known her twelve years ; rather longer than you have ; and I have never known her to be other than a Universalist, in which faith she was educated from a child. She is a friend whom I highly respect and esteem ; and my affection for her can never be weakened by any difference of religious opinion. We have had our discussion together, in the spirit of love and kindness ; at least, such was my feeling, and I have no reason to doubt hers.

My *sarcasm* offends you ; then, sir, you should not have provoked it first by your fulsome compliment, which it is now doubly evident was never sincerely uttered ; and, secondly, by your tone of insolent invective. When a man violates the courtesies of debate by using language personally abusive, he merits no other than sarcasm in reply. I have not uttered sarcasm when actually speaking of serious things ; but I perceive a difference between the subject of the soul's final destiny and those things that I have dealt sarcastically with. In this letter I intend to lay the whole mass of your abusive language *under the table*, unanswered.

You say that I have said in town that "if I could not meet Mr. Foster in the defense of my questions, I would get some fun out of it." I have said no such thing. Either take my word for it, or give the name of your informer.

In your appended note, I find the following, viz. "I know that you boast of holding two discussions with Universalist ministers, and that you vanquished them, for they withdrew. And I have learned from absolute evidence, that they were so disgusted with the method presented that they would have nothing to do with it."

"Absolute evidence" is something that ought to be questioned with caution ; but either you, or some one else, knows more about my past history than I do, and being always ready to increase my stock of information, I would most respectfully inquire who these ministers were ?

I mentioned, incidentally, in my last, that I had by me the MSS. of three discussions with Universalists, but they were not *ministers*, or I should have said so; they were all *females*; they were good scholars, and able writers, and I felt myself benefited by the discussion. If they withdrew "in disgust," they did so courteously. As to ministers, I have never changed one word on Universalism, either spoken or written, with any other one than yourself, neither did I ever claim to have done so.

In regard to these two statements, I do not wish to say that any one has wilfully belied me. Every one knows that *rumor* is not reliable evidence, and that a story need not pass through many hands before becoming changed so as not to be recognizable, and that, too, without malicious intention on the part of any. You have weakly allowed yourself to pick up these idle tales and treat them as well established facts. Rumor has said some strange things of Mr. Foster during the past year; but it did not occur to me that should I pick them up and place them in my MS., they would at all ornament my style, or strengthen my argument in defense of my faith.

Perhaps this will be as good a place as any to answer that question, so pertinent to the discussion, "What are you going to do with the certain Universalist members which you have in the Congregationalist and Baptist churches of this town?"

If there are any such they ought to be excommunicated, and they would be if they were known. Every member of an Orthodox church has publicly and solemnly pledged his belief in, and his determination to support, a very different doctrine. Therefore, if any of them are really Universalists, they are perjured deceivers, and too cowardly to take their stand with their true brethren.

You perceive that you make a far more serious charge against the individuals, than you do against the churches who may have been deceived by them. Consider if you are able to substantiate it, in case you are called upon to do so, or if your evidence on this point is rumor also. Consider, also, if you are not claiming pretty hard characters for Universalists.

In this place, and in several expressions you have previously used, there are tokens that you either think, or wish to have others think, that Orthodox Christians believe that a profession of religion, according to an Orthodox creed, insures salvation, than which nothing can be further from the truth.

In regard to the *petitio principii*, I perceive that you now regard me as guilty of it, because in my second communication I stated my propositions, supporting each by simple scripture reference and then waited your reply, in order that if you had any objections to make as to the force of the texts employed, I might hear and answer them before going further.

Article 1st of our agreement reads: "We will accept as an authoritative book of reference the common English version of the Holy Bible." Your first communication contains these words, viz. "I am ready to do it" (i. e. discuss) "on the Bible foundation, and that only."

Now the only right way to discuss any question on these terms would be to let commentators and Greek authors and Latin Fathers entirely alone, and to support our positions by simple scripture references; sustaining the different interpretations of which we might deem such scripture capable, by comparison with other scripture, and careful examination of the different meanings which contested words might bear: this would be as truly logical a course as it would be to demonstrate a problem in mathematics by reference to axioms; and would be characterized by about the same degree of "*obliquity*," and would "*reason in a circle*" about as much as do some of the first demonstrations of every Geometry. This is the way I desired to discuss, and have only referred to the commentators and lexicons in reply to your first use of them.

You complain that I have only tried to prove your argument false. Yes, sir, I promised you I should do so, and I intend to do so still. The "*reductio ad absurdum*" is a perfectly fair and logical method of argument; and you very often attempt it yourself.

I wish next to notice your use of what Arch-Bishop Whately says of the fallacy of references, which, added to your former charges, you repeat so often and in such manner as forcibly to suggest that celebrated piece of literature, the sermon on the text, "*He played on a harp of a thousand strings!*" Any one reading your quotations from Whately can see that the fallacy he condemns is *not* the employment of references, but the dishonest introduction of references not pertinent to the subject, "trusting that nineteen out of twenty readers will never take the trouble of turning to the passages, but taking for granted that they afford each some confirmation of what is main-

tained, will be overawed by seeing every assertion supported by five or six texts of scripture."

I will only say that my limited allowance of time and strength, alone, prevented me from writing my references in full. I had no old books from which to cut and insert them as you did, and if I had, the weak state of my eyes has, for some time, forbidden me to read fine type; and although you inserted many of yours in full, I was obliged to use the references and read the text from a large Bible. So far from "trusting that people would not read my references," it was my earnest wish that they *would* do so. It is evident that *you* have not taken the trouble, preferring to take it for granted that they were fallacious, without examination.

You say, "In this way I might assert my belief, and fasten it on paper to the Bible, and send it to you, but it would be no argument; it would be a fallacious method."

Sir, I expected you to begin your argument as you did, by asserting your belief. This would simply be telling what you intended to prove; and because of your assent to Article I. of our agreement, I expected you would *try* to prove your points by reference to Scripture.

Why not, if you are really able? I accept the whole Bible as inspired truth, as God's word. I am solemnly pledged to govern my belief and my practice by its teachings. All you have to do to convince me that Universalism is true, is to show me that it is *in the Bible*; and not tell me what the gospel is according to Ballou, Whittemore, or A. C. Thomas, in whose writings I have long since found every argument you have yet used, and many that you have not.

Neither would I ever suffer any commentator, that ever wrote, to guide me in the fundamental principles of faith. The Bible, and that alone, was my guide. Satisfied that I there found the revealed will of God, I accepted confidently its teachings.

Commentators are not inspired, and may err. Their opinions are to be respected as *opinions*, merely,—not in any case to be substituted for the Bible as a rule of faith, feeling and doing.

But, so far from discussing as you agreed to do, you have introduced into the argument, with the desire that I should regard them as "authoritative books of reference," also, no less than forty-four authors,—English, Greek, Latin and German;

some of them bulky folios; some in many volumes, and covering thousands of pages; many of them not to be found nearer than the nearest college library. Any "fallacy of reference" in that? Any trusting that nineteen out of twenty readers would or could never take the trouble to examine for themselves?

Most of these authors, you confess, were Orthodox. It must, then, be evident to any one that the quotations you make from them, and the sentiments you attribute to them, do not fairly and fully represent their views and feelings; if so, they would not have lived and died Orthodox, and (as in the case of Paley, Watts and Doddridge) have left behind them writings which have converted manifold more to the Orthodox belief than did their labors while living.

Let the reader compare the statement you make in regard to Dr. Johnson, viz. "He confessed that the passages that speak of eternal punishment must admit of a mitigated interpretation," with the following passage from his biography, viz.:

"His writings contain more explicit and solemn references to the grand purposes of human life, to a future judgment and to eternity, than almost any other moralist has had the piety, or the courage, to make;" and also with the fact stated further on, that a short time before his death, he cast aside all his doubts, and heartily and joyfully accepted the truths of evangelical religion, and draw his own conclusions

The language you ascribe to Dr. Barnes, being divorced from its true connection, fails to represent his real sentiments, which are well known. The quotation from Dr. Beecher was written by him upon an entirely different subject than the doctrine of future punishment, in the belief of which he died.

With these few remarks, I dismiss the forty-four authors, with the exception of Origen. I have expected him for some time, for Universalists do not argue long without introducing his ghost. The fact seems to be, sir, that Origen's theology was of too shaky a sort to afford very strong support to any one. He is claimed by the materialists as well as the Universalists. King styles him "learned and accomplished." But, in his book against Celsus, he says that "the incurably wicked shall be punished without end;" he believed in the transmigration of souls, and

taught, also, that "the righteous in heaven would sin, and be cast into hell again," etc. Pass on, pale shade of Origen!

As to the different views that are expressed by the commentators, in regard to which particular texts teach most strongly the doctrines which they all unite in believing, proving that the Orthodox house is "divided against itself," let me just hint to you the far more radical difference between Universalism as taught by Father Murray, and that style which is taught at the present day.

The trouble about Adam Clark seems to be, that you like some things that he has said better than you do others, and so do I; and they do not happen to be the *same* things. Now, if—just to oblige you—I accept his views on Matt. xvi: 27, 28, will you accept his views of 2 Thess. i: 7-10; or do you retract your promise to "ask no more of me than you were willing to grant in return?"

Remember, the point was whether there would be a second coming of Christ to judge the world in the way and manner that Orthodox christians hold, and remember that Adam Clark believes and teaches that there *will*.

You talk about our "best commentators," and name among them writers scarce ever heard of, and impossible to find. Please grant us the privilege of knowing who really are our best commentators. Do not pick out a few that suit *you*, and then cast aside everything that they say, except a few passages which, taken alone, favors your interpretation of some texts. It does not look well.

In regard to the statements formerly made, viz. "That Universalists distribute the meanings of *aion* and its derivatives," and that they reason, "that if the thing revealed is beyond their understanding therefore it cannot be true," I remark, that I have made these statements, and I stand by them. I have not reasoned about them "in a circle," or otherwise; nor do I propose to reason at all about them. Those who know me, know whether to trust my word or not and your doubts on the subject affect me little.

I *do* think that when a person refuses belief in anything, giving as a reason for doing so that he does not understand it, and that it *is* "the same thing as reasoning that because that thing is beyond their understanding, therefore it cannot be true;" and there are many in this town that have said just that.

And when I say that I will believe whatever the Bible reveals, whether I can understand it or not, and that some things I will believe *because* I do not understand them, there are scarce a dozen Universalists who would not answer me with scornful laughter. And yet the very things which best prove the divine inspiration of scripture must be thus accepted.

In regard to the force of *aion* and its derivatives. I am happy to see that you at last agree with me.

My statement was that "in whatever connection they were used they always denoted the longest duration of which the thing referred to was capable." You now say that "when joined with anything of a limited duration they have a limited meaning: but when joined with anything of endless duration they have an 'endless meaning.'"

The only thing that now remains to be considered is whether punishment is one of those things that are capable of endless duration. I affirm, you deny.

Punishment has two significations. One is where it is applied to disciplinary dealings, having for its object the improvement and reformation of the subject. This is *chastisement*, "whereof all are partakers" and is referred to in Heb. xii. The other definition is one in which it is employed to denote the full and final reward of crime. This is *vengeance* and is spoken of in Jude, 7.

The final reward of the wicked is never called *chastisement* in Scripture, neither are the righteous ever threatened with *vengeance*. We never hear of *eternal chastisement* but we do hear of *eternal vengeance*. Chastisement, because a temporary and reformatory measure, is *not* capable of endless duration. Vengeance, because final *is* capable of endless duration.

We see these things illustrated in the operation of human laws. When a man is mulcted in a fine, or suffers brief imprisonment, he is *chastised*, with the hope that in future he will take warning and reform. But when he is imprisoned for life, he suffers the *vengeance* of the law, which punishes him now, not to secure his reformation, but to secure the peace and safety of society.

It is not, then, quite correct to say that "the moment punishment becomes endless, it ceases to be punishment and becomes revenge;" for revenge is in itself a word of limited signification, being simply *retaliation*. But it would be perfectly correct to say

that the moment punishment became endless it ceased to be *chastisement*, and became *vengeance*; and the *vengeance of God is precisely what the Bible threatens as the portion of the wicked hereafter.*

I reason thus: Vengeance is capable of endless duration. Punishment, in one form, is vengeance, therefore punishment may have an endless duration. Therefore *aionion* punishment is endless punishment. Q. E. D.

In regard to the force of *aionion* in Matt. xxv : 46, hear ADAM CLARK. "I have seen the best things that have been written in favor of the final redemption of damned spirits; but I have never seen an answer to the argument against that doctrine drawn from this verse, but what sound learning and criticism would be ashamed to acknowledge."

Your references to the use of the word everlasting in connection with "covenant," "priesthood," "doors," "mountains," etc., need no reply, as they do not at all militate against my definition of *aionion*.

In the quotation, "the earth with her bars was about me forever:" we have simply an expression of the despair which Jonah felt while yet in the body of the whale, with no expectation of deliverance, not a subsequent statement in regard to what actually did take place.

You say that you rely for proof of the salvation of the righteous upon the phrase "resurrection of the dead." Regarding this phrase you affirm that, "*in all our Saviour's, and in all Paul's description of the resurrection state we have no description of two classes; no representation of two conditions; and no affirmation that that resurrection was according to any profession or works in this world.*"

Jesus says in Jno. v : 28, 29. "The hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; *they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.*"

To me, these verses *really seem* to declare; (1st) that there will be "*two classes*" at the resurrection: (2nd) that they will be divided *according to their works in this world*; (3d) that they will find themselves in "*two conditions*;" and I should think that *one of them was better than the other.*

Paul speaks in Heb. xi: 35, of certain faithful martyrs who "desired a *better* resurrection." And in Acts xxiv: 15, he spoke of "the resurrection of the dead, both of the *just* and the *unjust*." The order of resurrection is spoken of several times in Scripture, by which it appears that the righteous will have the precedence. Paul says in 1 Thes. iv: 16, that "the dead which are in Christ shall rise first.

And in Rev. xx: 6, it is declared, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection, *on such the second death hath no power*." And in Rev. xxi: 8, we are told who *will* "suffer the second death." In 1 Cor. xv: 23, 24, we also have an allusion to the order of the resurrection. "Christ the first fruits," (already raised) "then they which should be Christ's at his coming," then "the end." This "end" is described by Christ in Matt. xiv: 30, 42.

If Paul taught that all mankind would be saved, what mean his solemn warnings against apostacy in Heb. x: 26-31? What means that awful imprecation with which he closes his letter to the Corinthians.. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha?" (1 Cor. xvi: 22) What mean his fears "lest having preached to others he should himself be a cast-away?" (1 Cor. ix: 27.) But I pass to a consideration of your proofs.

The 1st is Matt. xxii: 30. Let us turn to the same story as given in Luke xx: and connect it with your 3d text, Luke xx: 35, 36. Let us here notice that Christ says that these things shall be true of "they which shall be counted worthy to obtain that world." The promise of Christ, in John xiv: 19, was spoken to his chosen disciples, Luke xx: 38. "He is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." As I have before remarked, we do not believe in the annihilation of the wicked. The inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah are recognized in the New Testament, as living, as plainly as Christ here recognizes Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their condition is also told in Jude 7: They were "*suffering the vengeance of eternal fire*."

The promises in 1 Cor. xv: 12, 49, 54; and 2 Cor. v: 1, are not addressed to *all mankind*, but to *converted persons*.

These verses are found in a *letter*. We know for whom a letter is intended by looking at its address. We shall find the address of these letters at the opening of each. That of the first is "To

the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints" etc. That of the second, "unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with the saints which are in all Achaia."

I see you attempt to disprove the statement made in my former letter that "not one of Paul's epistles was addressed to unconverted persons," by showing "two out of many" texts, which really prove nothing at all except that there were some among the members of the churches addressed who were ignorant and weak in faith, and I hardly think that the evidence drawn from the superscriptions of these letters will very soon "crumble to ruins" before that.

I propose now to examine your reply to my question as to what phrase, either in Greek or English, would, in your view, express eternal punishment so as not to be capable of being misunderstood. From the answer I see that the word which you regard as expressing endless duration is *akataluton*.

If Matt. xxv: 46, read *apeleusontai outoi eis kolasin, akataluton, oi de dikairoi eis zoen akataluton*, rendered these shall go away into *endless* punishment, but the righteous into life endless" you would grant that it taught my doctrine.

Now in the first place, to be consistent, you should refuse to believe in the endless life of the righteous until you can find *akataluton* used to express that idea also. In the second place, it is not strictly correct to render it by the word "*endless*." Its true meaning is "*indissoluble*," "*indestructible*."

It is a very unimportant and unusual word. The best Greek Lexicons give but a single reference to its use in all the classic Greek writers, and that is by Dionysius of Halicarnassus—a historian of no great merit. The more distinguished Greek writers never used it. It is found *not once* in the Septuagint, and *only* once in the New Testament, and that once in Heb. vii: 16 where the priesthood of Christ is said to be "after the power of an endless life."

If *akataluton* had been here translated according to its prime meaning the idea of the text would be more clear and forcible; for clearly the reference is to the inherent perfection, vigor, and indestructible nature of Christ's priesthood, in contrast to the imperfect and changeable character of that established by Mosaic law.

The stronger word of the two, therefore is *aionios*, the proper grammatical structure of which gives as its sense *never* ending, in *aieon*. The Vulgate translates *aionion* by "*eternam*," eternal: and Heb. vii: 16 it translates *akataluton* by "*insolubilis*," insoluble. You have granted that *aionion* "has endless signification" when applied to anything capable of endless duration, and the same thing needs, apparently, to be true of *akataluton*.

But it says in Heb. vii: 17, "Thou art a priest forever" (*aiona*) "after the order of Melchizedek." Now if the priesthood of Christ be endless in the 16th verse, it is endless in the 17th verse also; *akataluton* expresses the idea in the 16th verse: *aiona* in the 17th verse. Now "things that are equal to the same thing are equal to each other," therefore *aiona* means endless. Q. E. D.

The subject of repentance will now be taken up.

The difference of our views on this point results from our different ideas of its nature. I regard it as *an act*, which man, as an intelligent and morally responsible being, can do, or leave undone, by the exercise of his own free choice. You regard it as an *event*, which will as inevitably *happen to him*, as the hour of his death. To sustain your view you advance several texts.

Having already in a previous letter given my views on Heb. viii: 11, 12, quoted by Paul from Jer. xxxi: 34, I will not again repeat them. As to John xvii: 3, I have no doubt that the true knowledge of God will lead to eternal life. The text in Isaiah xlv: 24, which you quote "surely shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength," actually reads, "Surely shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come, and *all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed*."

I wonder if Dr. Whately says anything about the fallacy of quotations?

Jno. vi: 45. "And they shall all be taught of God:" quoted by Christ from Isaiah liv: 13. The whole chapter contains prophecies concerning, and promises to the church of Christ.

Ps. xxii: 27 is spoken of "kindreds and nations" collectively, not of individuals. Our Country, as a nation, holds the rank and character of Christian, yet there are thousands of Atheists, Jews, and Chinese idolaters among its population.

Isa. xlv: 23. "I have sworn by myself, that unto me every knee shall bow," etc. This will be fulfilled at the judgment day,

as we are taught by Paul in Rom. xiv : 10, 12 where he quotes this text and applies it. But this does not prove the willing and joyful submission to Christ ; any more than conquered rebels can be proved to be willing and joyful subjects of the victorious government.

It is said of Christ that "He shall make his *enemies* his footstool," in allusion to the practice common among ancient conquerors, of treading upon the necks of their vanquished foes. Christ's *friends* are represented as standing "around the throne," and "at his right hand," instead.

You place emphasis on "*must*" in the text "ye must be born again," to prove that no man can help repenting.

The word translated "*must*" here, as well as "*must*" itself, in usage still common, has the force of a command, and not a declaration. The same is true of "*shall*." "Ye must be born again" might just as correctly be translated "ye shall be born again," and is one of Christ's commands.

Commands are laws. Now law implies two things ; the ability of the subject to obey ; and the possibility of his disobedience ; hence penalties are affixed to laws ; than which nothing could be more cruel if the subject had not the ability to obey, except the infliction of the penalty all the same if he did obey.

Christ says in Luke xiii : 3. "Except ye repent ye shall *all* likewise perish," and you argue that repentance can in no way clear a person from the result of sin. It seems then, that obedience to these commands will receive, in your view, *precisely the same treatment as disobedience*.

Again, if the subject were not free to obey, and the command only announced an inevitable result, then it would be of no authority at all ; and its utterance would be as senseless as a command to *grow old*.

Look at the Decalogue. Here are God's commands ; and the "thou shalt not" is as emphatically uttered as possible. You cannot doubt that it is the will and pleasure of God that these commands should be obeyed ; but does it prove that all men *do*, and *necessarily must* obey them ?

You try to prove your statement that "repentance can in no way clear a person from the result of sin," by quoting two texts : Prov. xi : 21, and Col. iii : 25, which were spoken of those *who do*

not repent; one from 1 Cor. iii : 8, which speaks simply of the different rewards which different degrees of service will receive, and has no allusion to repentance whatever; and one, in Ex. xxxiv : 7, which promises mercy and forgiveness to some, and declares that God will "by no means clear the guilty."

Let me beg you to read, in reply to this, Ezek. xviii : 20-32. Does not the prophet declare that God will show mercy to them that repent, and will not remember their sins against them? Look at Ps. xxxiii : 1, 2: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." This is quoted also by Paul, in Rom. iv : 7, 8, in his argument showing that faith is counted for righteousness. See also 2 Cor. v : 17. Do these declarations look as if repentance could in no way "clear a person from the result of sin?"

You also affirm, in answer to my inquiry, that "the Bible conditions of salvation are certainty of punishment." Pray tell me, then, from what are men saved?

Not from *sinning*, for all men sin; nor from *death*, for all die; nor from *future punishment*, for you say, this was never threatened nor intended; nor yet from *present punishment*, for you teach that there can be no escape from the result of sin.

Your doctrine, then, presents a Redeemer whose "Great Redemption" frees us from nothing; a Saviour whose great salvation relieves from nothing; and talks of the mercy of a God who forgives nothing.

If men must certainly suffer the full penalty of their sins, and there is no escape, talk no longer of the mercy of God; utter no word of His forgiving love! Blot the words, salvation and redemption, from your teachings! Forbid the "weary and heavy laden" soul to bow in penitence before the throne of One who sits in cold relentless silence,—leaving his suppliant unanswered, unrelieved in the inexorable grasp of law!

Thank God for Christ's own assurance, that His blood was shed "*for the remission of sins*," (Matt. xxvi : 28.) and for the assurance that *repentance* will secure this remission, (Mark i : 4,) and that this remission secures *salvation* (Luke i : 77.) (See also Acts ii : 38; x : 43; Rom. iii : 25; Heb. x : 17, 18.)

The statements that "repentance can in no way clear a person from the result of sin," and that "the Bible conditions of salvation are certainty of punishment," make the use of the words, "mercy," "forgiveness," "pardon," "redemption," "salvation," and "remission of sins," entirely meaningless; and explain clearly the reason why you, in your first communication, refused to be "trammelled" by the definitions of a standard dictionary.

Let us proceed. Your next quotation is Prov. xi : 21, once more.

You recollect, I suppose, that you gave an unqualified assent to my first and second propositions. These were, "The Bible everywhere makes a broad distinction between two classes, called by the general names of the righteous and the wicked," and "This distinction is everywhere represented as resulting from God's love of righteousness and abhorrence of wickedness."

Now, no one *can* or *will* dispute that all mankind commit sin and are sinners. The term, "wicked," then, does not refer to those who have committed sin simply, otherwise there could not exist *two* classes *broadly distinguished* from each other; for all mankind would be wicked, and there would be none that were righteous. But this is contrary to the Bible, and to your own belief, also.

The text, in Prov. xi : 21, only tells that "*the wicked* shall not go unpunished." Just so I think. But with the *righteous* it will be *different*, and there will be a *broad distinction* made.

This distinction, however, is not apparent, in this world. The wicked "still prosper in this world," and "many afflictions" are still the portion of the righteous. When David "thought to know this, it was too painful for him, until he went into the sanctuary of God, and understood their end." But, "in the day when the Lord shall make up his jewels, the difference shall be plainly discerned. Mal. iii : 16-18.

Did you intend to make the admission which appears on the top of the thirty-seventh page of your MS., that the wicked were those who die in an unconverted state? If so, it makes all clear of itself.

You say that "Orthodoxy is continually preaching to all mankind just as the serpent preached to Eve in the garden, viz. Ye shall not surely die."

Before you can prove this point, you must prove that we accept your idea of repentance, as something that will inevitably take place in every man's life. This we do not accept. Repentance must be freely exercised by man as a moral agent.

Orthodoxy preaches, "repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out;" "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish;" "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Orthodoxy preaches just as all are commanded to preach in Ezek. xxxiii: 7-16.

You also say that "the first Universalist sermon ever preached in this world was preached by God to Eve, when he said 'in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.'"

Universalists do not preach this *in any sense that ever serves to deter men from sin.*

And now comes that other statement, viz. "The preaching of endless punishment, and its terms of salvation, is the most pernicious of all errors, and is virtually a premium on sin."

I remark (1st) that drunkards, gamblers, profane swearers, Sabbath breakers, etc., are not generally of that opinion, judging from their *words* as well as their *actions*. It was a Universalist who said to me, that there was no need to leave off swearing, according to his belief. It was a dissolute and profane man who expressed his preference for Universalism, saying in language not at all elegant, that it was because "they were not so tormented hard on a fellow that did wrong." I have heard a Universalist argue in language too blasphemous to be repeated.

(2.) Universalism *fails* to reform men from vicious practices; Orthodoxy *does not*.

Take a swearer for example. Let him believe that no act of his can affect his immortal destiny, whether that act be right or wrong; that though he fall dead, as did one whom I once knew, when words of horrid cursing, that caused bystanders to shudder, had but just passed his lips, yet he would pass at once to joy and glory in Heaven; let him believe further, that even should he repent it would make no difference with him; and I say that man has *no inducement* to reform which the very next temptation to indulge in his vice would not *annihilate*.

But now let that man be converted to Orthodoxy, and he will *at*

once reform. *You would yourself expect it; you would say that his conversion was not genuine if he did not.*

(3.) Orthodox Christians teach that *repenting and returning sinners will be saved*; Universalists teach that *all mankind will be saved*. Is the sinner made worse by repenting? Then where is the "premium on sin?"

(4.) In the month of July, 1835, the Universalist Convention of Maine passed a resolution that "*No man known to be addicted to habits of drunkenness, gambling, profane swearing, or who is an unbeliever in Christianity, SHOULD BE APPOINTED TO OFFICE IN THAT SOCIETY!*" ("Trumpet," July 11th, 1835.) What would be said by Universalists should the ministerial conventions of any Orthodox denomination find it necessary to pass such a resolution?

(5.) You are horrified because we "proclaim," you say, "to the blackest of criminals, the pirate and murderer, no matter how black your sins may be, if you will repent, you will escape the consequences of sin—escape endless punishment."

We *do* preach this, except that we do *not* preach that they will escape all the consequences of sin. We do not "give to understand that there is little or no punishment for sin in this world;" for of punishment in the sense of *chastisement*, there is much; but do those teachings offer a premium on sin above that offered by the doctrine which "says to the blackest of criminals, the pirate and murderer," if you continue in sin, if you die with your hands reeking with innocent blood, still you will escape all future punishment? Let wise men judge.

As to your remarks concerning the utterances of those who die on the scaffold, the inferences are strained certainly. No Orthodox believer would ever dare presume to say confidently either that Lavigne was saved, or Mrs. Griswold lost; for we cannot know the secrets of the heart. God knows, and will not deal unjustly by either. You, however, feel certain that both were saved. So of the other case you mention.

(6.) There is one crime that Universalism certainly offers a premium to, and that is deliberate suicide; for if that doctrine be true, the sooner a man dies, the sooner he is in Heaven—a much more desirable place than this world according to every belief; and that is a crime that Orthodox religion cannot offer a

premium to, because he who commits it deprives himself of any opportunity to repent.

A few more references.

(1.) Eph. i : 9, 10, which is equivalent to Isa. xv : 43, already explained.

(2.) Isa. xiv : 24, 27, spoken of God's determination to punish the Assyrians, as is plainly declared in the 25th verse, which was prudently omitted.

(3.) Gen. xii : 3; xxii : 18, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." I see it says *nations*, not *individuals*. Christianity is to-day blessing all "nations," yet many individuals fail to receive the blessing.

(4.) Heb. vi : 13, 14. Cannot perceive what this has to do with the salvation of all mankind.

(5.) 1 Tim. ii : 4. I replied to this in my last, and that reply has not yet been refuted.

(6.) 1 Tim. ii : 2, 8, is simply an exhortation to pray for all men. And just here comes in the most remarkable argument yet encountered. I will try to state it fairly.

1st. You should pray for all men, 1 Tim. ii : 1, 2.

2d. You should pray without doubting, 1 Tim. ii : 8.

3d. If you thus pray, you pray for Universalism to be true; if you do not thus pray, your prayer "is of sin," and you are "damned" according to Rom. xiv : 23.

In reply:

1st. I pray that all men may submit to the requirements of the gospel, and embrace the offers of mercy. Whether I always pray in undoubting faith or not, I cannot certainly affirm, not having always the power to accurately analyze the motions of my mind. I *do not* pray for any one to be saved *in their sins, without repentance*. I should not dare thus to pray for myself. Neither is it at all commanded, either in your references, (which really say nothing about what we are to ask for when we pray for all men, unless it be contained in the last clause of the second verse,) or elsewhere.

In 1 Jno. v : 16, it is more than intimated that there is a sin for which, could we know by whom it is committed, we ought not to pray. But because we cannot know the secrets of the heart, and because God would have us filled with the charity that "thinketh

no evil," we are commanded to pray for all, and labor for all, and leave results to Him. Therefore, I do not pray for Universalism to be true.

2d. In regard to the condemnation threatened in Rom. xiv: 23; I should think that you would regret that the word "eat" was in that verse, as it would, with the majority of readers, cause a perusal of the previous verses; when it would be seen at once that the apostle was saying *not one word* about the degree of faith with which we should *pray*. There can be no doubt that whatever acts we commit having no faith that they are right, "are of sin," and will merit condemnation.

The next subject considered will be whether the Old Testament teaches anything of the immortality of the soul. I advanced, to prove that it did so, five reasons. Two of these, the second and fourth, you have not noticed; the first and third barely alluded to, without answering.

(I am not able to find those "best philosophers;" of course they were *mental*; the question does not belong to either natural or moral philosophy. The remark in regard to Moses which I spoke of hearing you make April 16th, was not the one you have quoted; please look at that sermon once more; I remember that one, too; but the one I mean came not long after it.)

I proceed to review your reply to my New Testament evidence that the Old Testament taught the immortality of the soul.

(1.) The "crushing force" of your proof from 2 Tim. i: 9—11, of which the whole pith lies in the last clause of the 10th verse, viz. "And hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," is *not felt at all*. I do not argue that the world, previous to Christ, had as clear and correct views of the nature of the immortal life and their relation to it, as he imparted. Their age was, as it were, the twilight which preceded the noon-day splendor which the gospel dispensation brought. They "saw as through a glass darkly" what Jesus Christ "brought to light."

(2.) Your quotation from Job xiv: 14, viz. "If a man die shall he live again?" was really answered by Job himself in the next breath, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my *change* come," not *annihilation*, not *death*, not *end*, but *change*; and no one speaks more confidently than Job, of a hope in the resurrection. See Job xix: 25—27. As to Christ's reply: "Thy brother

shall rise again," it had no reference to the immortal life whatever, but simply to the miracle he was about to perform. Martha supposed that he referred to the "resurrection at the last day," and the idea seemed no new thing to her.

(3.) I would inquire why it is that death is so often spoken of in the Old Testament as *sleep* unless in reference to a future wakening.

(4.) I inquired how the Pharisees obtained their knowledge of a future life. You reply: "They had been in contact with the Egyptians, who were heathen, four hundred years, between the Old Testament and the New Testament, and here is where they learned the belief in the immortality of the soul, and where they learned the heathen creeds or doctrines of a personal devil, original sin, miraculous conversion, total depravity, and endless punishment."

Now, in the first place, it is quite as susceptible of proof that the Egyptians obtained all the ideas they had on these doctrines from the Jews, whose scriptures were in the Alexandrian Library, long before the coming of Christ. And in the next place, if you are right, this same important and glorious doctrine of the immortality of the soul had actually been revealed in some way before Christ came; therefore, he did not "bring it to light" in the sense claimed for your "crushing text!"

And again you have claimed two doctrines for the Egyptians, viz. "Original sin and miraculous conversion," which I challenge you to prove ever belonged to any heathen creed whatever.

As to miraculous conversion, it occurred in St. Paul's case, but is not so common as to found a doctrine. I am not myself able to distinguish between original sin and total (or rather native) depravity.

"And," you ask, "what does Christ say of these doctrines? 'Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees,'" Matt. xvi: 12.

Sir, is it possible that you cannot see the inconsistency of that quotation? If he meant to warn his disciples against these doctrines, why did he include the *Sadducees* in his warning? *They did not hold them!* If he meant to warn his disciples against these doctrines, did he not warn them against belief in immortality also?

The fact was, that the Pharisees' doctrines were in the main correct, as Christ himself acknowledged in Matt. xxiii: 2, 3, where he bade his disciples to obey their rule and teaching, but not follow their example as to works. They had, indeed, corrupted the faith, by adding traditions to the commandments, and for this they were reprov'd in this same chapter, Matt. xxiii: 16—22; and also in Matt. xv: 3—6.

(5.) You say that the Essénes, the other Jewish sect, were the Universalists of that day, and that Christ nowhere warns any one against their doctrine.

The Essénes were a very inconsiderable sect, few in numbers, and without either social or political power or influence, any more than the Shakers (whose doctrines they really resemble more than any other) have with us.

They "maintained that religion consisted wholly in contemplation and silence. Some of them passed their lives in celibacy; others embraced matrimony, which they considered lawful if entered into with the sole design of propagating the species. They looked upon the law of Moses as an allegorical system of spiritual and mysterious truths, and renounced in its explication all regard to the outward letter." (Neander's Church History.)

Really, I can see no great resemblance of this sect to the Universalists of the present day, unless it be in the *last particular*; there certainly is none in the *second*, nor the *first*.

(6.) You dismiss my New Testament quotations summarily, by saying: "You might as well say that the New Testament refers to Judaism, therefore Judaism is immortal."

Not so fast, sir. The New Testament refers to Judaism, therefore *there was such a thing*. The New Testament refers, also, in Heb. xi: 13—16, to those who, living in the Old Testament times died in the hope of immortality; *therefore there were such persons*.

You say that "the faith in which the old prophets died was the faith in the coming Messiah, who should deliver Israel, and give them the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession."

Then first, their faith was not "the evidence of things not seen," as defined in the 1st verse of this chapter, for that was not the intended work of the Messiah; and second, the Scripture *says* "they confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth," and that "they desired a better country, that is an Heavenly;"

and thirdly, this was not spoken of the "old prophets" exclusively, for in the list are many other names, one of whom—David—died when Israel was at the zenith of power and needed no deliverance.

(7) You say that the affirmation that "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living" in Matt. xxii : 32, referring to Moses (?) and Isaac is simply a proof of the resurrection four hundred years after the Old Testament.

This in no way meets my argument, which was based, not on that verse but on the account given from the twenty-third to the thirty-second inclusive. Repetition is needless, but I will repeat.

The Sadducees, denying immortality, asked of Christ a question. Christ's reply was "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures." What scriptures? Evidently the Old Testament, for they had no other. Then Christ adds an argument from the same scriptures.

"Have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God saying 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob?' "God is not a God of the dead but of the living."

Thus does Christ himself teach the skeptical Sadducees, that the doctrine of the immortal life was plainly taught in one simple verse of the Old Testament scriptures. God could not have said to Moses "I am" the God of those whose bodies had been dead long years, if their souls were not living.

The parable of the Lost Sheep is next advanced.

You say "The sheep, though lost, belonged to the owner,—and was a sheep still." Certainly. It was not such an animal as is called a goat in Matt. xxv : 33.

"And he sought till he found it, and when he found it, he asked no questions,—how he wandered;"—Does this prove the sheep to have been one of the wicked ones, or one of the righteous who had yielded to temptation for a time?

"Neither did he require the sheep to answer any questions or do anything: he took up the sheep whether willing or not and took him back."

He required the sheep to submit to be taken back, and the willingness of the sheep to comply is apparent from the fact that he neither hid nor fled away.

The accounts which eastern travelers give of the customs of the shepherds of Palestine forcibly illustrate this parable. There is always exhibited by the sheep the most docile attachment to the

shepherd. Each one of the flock knows his name and will come when called. If, by any accident, one has become separated from the flock and is sought by the owner, he only needs to make the sheep hear his voice or see his person, and it will gladly run to him, if not too weak to do so; for when a sheep has lost its shepherd, it stops not to eat or rest, but continually runs up and down with piteous cries, until—if not found sooner—it is too much exhausted to do so longer.

O, when such is the yearning desire of any human soul towards the Good Shepherd, how sweet the promise comes that it shall be satisfied! That though weak and exhausted,—wounded and bleeding, He will even take such an one in His loving arms and bear it *home!*

I asked you if you recollected that a very respectable number of the first scholars the world has ever seen, have been and are found in the ranks of the Orthodox believers? I did not “bring this forward to prove the truth of endless punishment,” for I conceive that doctrine to be so plainly revealed, “that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.” I do not believe that important truth is ever hidden by God from all but the learned. I do not believe that in everything which it most concerns us to understand clearly, the Bible means something different from what it says.

I asked that question to meet your repeated assertion, that this, that, and the other view which you held was maintained “by the learned,” and the fact which you wished me to remember, viz. “That some of the best scholars the world has ever seen have been and are found among the Jews, Brahmins, Chinese and Roman Catholics,” can therefore be quite as profitably recollected by yourself, particularly, when you reflect that these are all believers in future punishment.

My question concerning your ability to produce a case parallel to the three young men I mentioned, you have *fairly met*. And the fault was my own, as I see by reference to my last; which was so hastily written that I did not express myself as I intended, or ought.

You mistake in their being all ministers. One became a minister, and since, a foreign missionary; one died before completing his theological studies; the other did not study theology at all.

All were designed by their parents for the Universalist ministry; and the father of the second—a man of abundant means—withdrew all pecuniary support from his son and threatened him with disinheritance, on account of his conversion.

Now what I wanted, was,—not names particularly,—but to learn whether you knew *personally* of any good *bona fide* Orthodox professors, who never had their faith shaken until they were converted by reading Greek.

You give me the names of six persons besides yourself. With how many of these you are personally acquainted, or how many of them never doubted Orthodoxy until forced to do so by reading Greek, doth not appear.

In regard to yourself, I have been told by one who professed to know, and who, I presume, had an opportunity, (for that person was a member of a family with whom you are, or have been quite intimate,) that you were a Universalist before you studied for the ministry. I know not what you were converted from when you became a Universalist, but am certain it was not from a belief in Orthodoxy; because if you are honest in your statements, as I trust you are, you are too unfamiliar with our views ever to have held them.

In regard to the two gentlemen whom you specify as having actually been members of Congregational churches, Professor Crosby and Dr. Clapp, they may or may not have been Orthodox. I do not know how old a man Professor Crosby is; but the probable age of Dr. Clapp, if living, suggests an item of history.

Every one, at all posted, knows how extensively and insidiously Unitarianism had infected the Congregational churches of New England some sixty years since, causing that general conflict and rending asunder of churches, which was commenced in the First Church of Dorchester, Mass., in 1811.

From this epoch in New England church history we received originally our distinctive title of Orthodox, which was for many years and in many places, very unfairly given to the denomination to which I belong alone; the term Congregational primarily having reference to the form of our church government only.

I acknowledge that there have been apostates from Orthodox churches, who "went out from us because they were not of us," but I deny that reading Greek made them so.

We believe that the *fact* of one's apostacy is *prima facie* evidence that he was never a true convert. *Once a sheep always a sheep*; and, though wandering, will seek the fold, and be found at last of the owner.

For myself, I regret that the discussion must close in this manner, for there are several points yet that I hoped we should examine together.

I regret, also, that you should deem me possessed of such "spirit" as you ascribe to me; but had rather you should *think* me so than to be conscious of *being* so. But my heart fully acquits me of the things with which you charge me; and I can only add, in closing, the prayer that He who in secret searches the heart, and sees the motive, may reward openly, by inclining the hearts of those who shall read to choose the doctrine that is *really* His.

Sincerely yours,

L. A. PROUTY.

CHESTER, September 20, 1869.

P. S.—In regard to publication, I will myself take the whole labor and responsibility; and will cause the work to be commenced immediately. I will send you the proof-sheets, if you will be so kind as to correct your part of them.

Please inform me, also, how many copies you desire, and I will see that you have them at prime cost of publication.

Sincerely yours, L. A. PROUTY.

REPLY.

CHESTER, Vt., Sept. 24, 1869.

MISS PROUTY—*Madam*:—Your last communication of the 15th inst., was received with much astonishment.

I supposed I was discussing a question with a person who knew that the negative always has the last speech. There is neither right, justice nor consistency in allowing your reply.

Not that it has any force to those who understand the Scriptures and our faith; but because it misrepresents nearly all matters of which I treated, and if allowed as you desire, it would

lead many innocent souls (who are searching for truth) into many great and pernicious errors.

There is misery, woe, and trouble enough in this world, without allowing this imprudent step.

Please understand me in all kindness: *I shall not allow this last reply of yours to be appended to the discussion.*

I have been repeatedly told by some of our best persons in town—those you esteem highly too,—that Miss Prouty will have the last word, no matter what we discuss, or which side she is on.” I could not then be persuaded to believe it, but I must now confess what I never expected to find true.

I think if you propose to be sincere and honest in this matter, that you will allow the discussion to close according to the rules which govern all discussions, unless previously arranged otherwise.

Please do not force me to take any ungentlemanly course, in order to do you justice.

I ask you, as a friend and brother in Christ, to let the principles of the Great Master govern you.

If you are not satisfied that you are now in a great error, please obtain one of your best clergymen, whom your denomination credit and esteem, and have him come to Chester, and we will arrange together for a public discussion on the same question, or any other touching the soul's salvation, and we will have a Boston reporter, and so give to the world our labors.

This is the only thing I am willing to do with you further. My time is too precious, and my duties too many and arduous to spend my labor in this way; and I say all this with the kindest feelings towards you. I think if you fully understood your own denominational faith, and also mine, and then the passages used to defend both, it would be very pleasant and profitable for the redemption of man, to discuss with you.

But I must close. You now must fully understand me.

With the best wishes for yourself in health and happiness, and that in due time you may enjoy the blessed faith in the great Redeemer,

I am truly yours in Christ,

E. S. FOSTER.

P. S.—You have still clung to acting the negative through all this last letter; and you virtually say to me, “You affirm, and I

deny." This method effectually begs the question all through, though you continually deny it; and now in this reply to the Discussion, you firmly claim the negative.

E. S. F.

LETTER OF NOV. 16, 1869, WHICH WAS WITH-
HELD BY MISS PROUTY.

CHESTER, VT. Nov. 16th, 1869.

MISS PROUTY—*Madam*.—I have learned that you have employed Mr. A. D. to correct and fit up the discussion, which has been held between us, for print. And you have done that, which I did not suppose you would do, especially, after I had requested that you act an honorable and Christian part.

You selected the question, assumed the Affirmative, and all the way through (in a very objectionable manner) played the part as if you was in the Negative, and then you claim the last speech and the last word. Now, if you wanted to be in the Negative, why did you not so make the question, and act with that Christian spirit, which would be an honor to truth and humanity? I learn, too, that you have had the work fitted up to suit yourself, all unbeknown to me, and have added your last reply, which I objected to in my last letter, of which you have taken no notice. And I learn you have been canvassing for subscribers for the work in this form.

Now, this is one of the most disagreeable arrangements which I ever knew to occur in all the discussions with which I am acquainted. I have no thought nor disposition to withhold the discussion from the community, neither do I think that you have advanced any thing, but what has been fully answered in every particular, and I am firmly in the belief, that, when the discussion comes to the public, as it took place, (and in the only allowable form of honorable discussion,) it will be the means of delivering many from darkness and error to truth and God. And I have been patiently waiting to hear from you, so that an honorable arrangement be made to bring it forth. But how different your course. And allow me to say in all good feeling; should you go on with this course, you will necessarily force me to advertise you

publicly in town, and to give the whole discussion and the letters to the public, and then to reply to your last communication and to have it printed; and under these circumstances it will be sent into every family in town. Though I was informed at the beginning, and have been several times during the correspondence, that you would pursue just this course, I could not believe you capable of so debasing an act. I ask you once more to desist from all, that in any way savors of dishonesty, selfishness or unchristian management in this matter. Before you proceed any further with the manuscripts, I ask you to inform yourself *legally* on your rights connected with them. I am willing to do any thing in this matter, which is allowable by a Christian spirit and judgment, not dictated by a Universalist; but am willing to refer it wholly to Congregational or Baptist referees, who are strangers to us both. But if you go on further in the course you are now pursuing, you will have to meet the matter in the *Court* of Vermont, as I am not to be trifled with in so solemn and serious a subject.

I mention these things that you may not rush blindly over the precipice; for I have a name and reputation that I do not sell to sarcasm, dishonor or defamation for a small sum. I am sorry to be under the necessity of asking such things of you, or to write in this way; but if I am compelled to meet you disguised as an angel of light, you must not find fault as you force me to battle. Hoping that your better judgment will triumph,

I am yours in Faith, Hope and Charity,

E. S. FOSTER.

REMARKS ON THIS LAST LETTER.

In connection with this letter of Nov. 16, 1869, I remark, that after the letters of Sept. 9, and 24, I waited to hear from you about publishing (according to parliamentary rules) the Discussion.

This honorable presentation you did not notice,—but made a scurrilous reply to the whole debate, and employed Mr. A. D—— to re-write and correct *your manuscripts* and then secretly sent them, with mine uncorrected, to Tuttle & Co. for publication.

Nov. 16, 1869, I accidentally learned the course you was pursuing, and wrote you the foregoing letter,—knowing that you

had violated your agreement. And this letter, together with your *first*, about opening the Discussion, you withheld from publication, which evidence makes the *label* of your book a *falsehood*.

Any one knowing your management in this discussion will see at once *why* you left out these letters.

Your first was left out to deceive the reader and make it appear that I was the challenging party. My last letter you left out because it effectually explained your treacherous course.

You could have had no other excuse in the premises, for your book was not all in type for several weeks after the receipt of the said letter.

And your whole course, *in* and *with* the Discussion, presents no devoted study of the Holy Word for the soul's benefit and redemption; but evinces great studiousness in misrepresentation, trickery and knavery.

Your thoroughly studied and accomplished method is to prevaricate, and then make the falsehood appear as belonging to your opponent.

Again. You have most effectually broken the *Articles of Agreement* between us.

First. You included some of the letters as parts of and relating to the debate, and excluded *others*; which materially misrepresents the whole matter. By so doing you broke the 2d and 3d articles of agreement.

Second. After the *close* of the Discussion, you added a reply to the whole debate, as a part of it, and published it, in opposition to all parliamentary rules, and without my knowledge.

You employed help to re-write and correct *your* manuscripts, and then corrected the proof-sheets of the same; but you allowed my manuscripts (all hastily written) to pass into book form, with all the printer's misunderstandings of the style, and without any corrections, save the words marked as spelled wrongly.

Thus you feloniously took my literary property, and secretly appropriated it to advance yourself and to injure me.

Each of these cases is a clear violation (as I view it), on your part, of the agreement, and, I think, would entitle me to a legal redress. But I pass it,—preferring charity to retaliation.

And, in this reply, which brings you to the *court of society*, I have only used words necessary to contest your slang phrases,

your scurrilous treatment, and the obloquy you have attempted to fasten on me.

You have, for years, cultivated this style of discussion with certain respectable Universalists, seemingly for the special purpose of thus tasking a Universalist minister to gain notoriety. And in these discussions you have become notorious.

Now, if it were not for those who stood back of you (the Orthodox ministers who have rendered assistance), and who have striven to make *capital* out of the united effort,—your book, with all its misrepresentations and falsehoods, would be unworthy of notice.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE BOOK ENTITLED
 "THE ENTIRE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN
 E. S. FOSTER AND L. A. PROUTY," AND OF
 MISS L. A. PROUTY'S REPLY TO THE DIS-
 CUSSION.

CHESTER, Vt., April — 1870.

MISS L. A. PROUTY,—

Madam:—A part of what is called "The Entire Correspondence between E. S. Foster and L. A. Prouty," is before me, in print, to which is appended a reply, as a part of said discussion.

Your book has been dictated and put together by you, without any assent of mine, or liberty given me (according to agreement) to correct the proof-sheets which you received.

What you have allowed of mine, comes to the public,—all imperfect as it was hurried on to paper, amid many cares and duties.

On the other hand, you employed Mr. D. to re-write and correct your manuscripts, and then you enjoyed the valuable privilege of *correcting* the proof-sheets of your part, and withheld the same from me.

And then you make a long *satirical reply* to the debate, and without any claim to right, justice, or respectability, add it to the *discussion* as a part of it.

And because you had the boldness and arrogance to defy all rules of honor and discussion, and make a sarcastic and brawling reply,—why, you vainly think you have gained a boasting victory, and so go about town, in the language of a low neighborhood quarrel, exclaiming, "I have beat Mr. Foster! I have whipped him out—I am enough for him—he is afraid to have it published, &c."

And *you* and some (only a few however) of your orthodox friends, really think that your conceited and sarcastic reply is a great victory, is something *smart*, and that the *stuff* is what a candid and prayerful discussion of the subject of *endless misery* demands.

Now, is this an honest course? Is it any less than deceiving the public? Is it any less than an attempt to dishonor me? Is it any less than stealing the advantage, when I trusted to your honesty? Is it not, to the utmost of your ability, making *your* work appear honest, consistent, and correct, and *mine* the opposite? Is it any less than *full evidence* of defamation of my character? Is it

doing as you would be done by in manifesting Christ while working to prove so terrible a doom as "*endless misery*?"

Because of your misrepresentations, duty to myself and to society, and the request of many of our best citizens, demand a reply.

And as, your last letter is a reply to the discussion, it is necessary for me, in this examination, to take in the scope of your labors.

WE WILL, IN THE FIRST PLACE, LOOK AT SOME OF YOUR ASSERTIONS WHICH SET FORTH YOUR MONSTROUS SELF-CONCEIT.

On page 6, of your book, are these words, viz. "I shall do my best to pull your arguments to pieces and put mine together so you cannot pull them to pieces."

Again, "While I make no claim to freedom from the traditional obstinacy of my sex, I hope to be found possessed also of a true woman's scorn for every thing opposed to candor, impartiality or earnest love for the good and true."

Compare this statement with the sarcasm and spirit of your whole letters.

Again. You say, "Choose your own ground and your own style. Here I stand opposed to your doctrines."

Again. On page 8, are these words, viz. "I deny that Calvinism (or orthodoxy), in Chester, has but one brave heart."

Again. On page 10, "I propose to defend Orthodox religion, not restrict myself to the peculiar doctrines of either Calvin, Luther, Wesley, or any other man."

Again. On page 13, and in first paragraph, are these words, viz. "If it is a privilege to you to criticise my style, you have my permission to enjoy it to the full. I may hereafter furnish you still further material for the exercise of your criticism."

Again, "The phrase, 'begging the question,' is familiar to me, but, in the name of logic, what question did I beg?"

Again. On page 14, and in first paragraph, are these words, viz. "Well, that text cost you just six pages of writing and may cost you more, unless you surrender it."

Again. On page 18, and in last paragraph but one, are these words, viz. "Verily, sir, I think you must understand Adam Clark in the same way you do Scripture, i. e. by the rule of contrary."

Again. On page 31, and in bottom paragraph, are these words, viz. "Well, sir, I have the advantage of you, then, in my acquaintance, both with the living and dead defenders of your faith."

Again. On page 61, art. 3, are these words, viz. "I deny the right of the negative to *dictate when the discussion shall close.*"

Again. On page 67, are these words in the third paragraph, viz. "I have made the statements that Universalists distribute the meanings of 'aion' and its derivatives, and I stand by them."

Again. On page 16, in art. 3, you attempt to make the blessed Saviour falsify his own prophesy, recorded in Matt. x : 23 and xvi : 27, 28 and in xxiv : 34.

Here is *superlative self-conceit* before the great Redeemer. And all these things from a *professed follower of Christ.*

Indeed, these evidences are so numerous, that it is very, *very* difficult to find one page of your letters which does not contain one or more. Hence, I am *fully assured* that no unprejudiced person will now dispute your possession of bombastic audacity, and monstrous self-conceit.

WE WILL NOW LOOK AT YOUR MORAL DISHONESTY IN MISREPRESENTATION.

Your *book* represents that it comes to the public by an agreement between us; while the fact is, I opposed your whole *dishonest course* and urged an honorable publication of the Discussion, and waited for your acceptance.

(2.) You obtained or hired Mr. A. D. to correct and re-write your manuscripts for the press; and then you allowed my manuscripts to pass into book form without any correction, *save* the words which I had marked as spelled wrongly, in my very hasty writing.

Again. You received the proof-sheets from the printer, corrected your letters, and then withheld the same from me, and allowed my hastily written parts to be inserted in book form, with all the printer's misunderstandings of my chirography.

And these things you have willfully done to defame me and *exalt yourself*; and done them in opposition to all obligations of right, justice, or Christianity, and in opposition to *your special pledge*, on page 84.

Under these circumstances you force your book on the public, as a *fair representation* of me and *my literary labors*.

(3.) I asked a favor of you in my second letter, viz. that, "under the great weight of my many cares and duties, I shall have no time to re-write any thing; and, from my very rapid writing, mistakes will occur, which must be received simply with a pen-mark across the word spelled wrongly or misused, and so left for future correction, when these things are to be made public."

Now, I had not time nor strength to copy my letters to you, but employed another to do it. I was only able to read them but *once* after writing, and the errors then detected were marked.

Yet you went from house to house, *gabbling* about Mr. Foster's *spelling*, while at the same time, your manuscripts contained the same errors, *without any pen-marks*. And even your part of the letters (when printed), *with all your outside aid and the privilege of correcting proof-sheets*, contain errors of both of these kinds.

(4.) You made Mr. A. F. B. (whom I believe to be a consistent Church member) to think that your book was printed by *mutual arrangement* between us, and that you sent me the proof-sheets for correction. Both of which are gross misrepresentations.

(5.) On page 19th, in last paragraph but one, you say, "It is left for the influential preachers of Universalism, in the noon of the nineteenth century, to speak of repentance scornfully, as a doctrine peculiarly the invention of Orthodox Christians."

Now, every person who knows *us* and our *literature*, knows this to be a superlative and willful misrepresentation, against reason, common sense, and Scripture.

(6.) On page 62, of your book, you say, "I am offended because of your sarcasm."

This is a misrepresentation! For I have never felt other than *deep pity* for your unfortunate *self-esteem*, vanity, and combativeness.

(7.) On page 33, and in first paragraph, you affirm that we are to discuss "on the Bible foundation and that only."

And you here represent *the quotation* to be *my special agreement*. And you represent that I have broken the same; and then you repeat the same misrepresentation on the top of page 64.

This shows your *perverse will*, and your superlative disposition to falsify what does not suit you.

Now, just turn to my first letter of May 31, 1869, and, in the abstract, the conditions are these, viz., "I will discuss the truth or falsity of our religious tenets, on the Bible foundation and that only, or on the basis of the Greek Lexicons. We will take the Bible and define our positions, from your Greek Orthodox Lexicons; this is all you can sincerely ask of me, I think."

(8.) Suppose now, that I made no *other* agreement, but your *double misrepresentation*, viz., "You agreed to discuss on the Bible foundation and that only."

I am sure of being sustained by all scholars, in the use of the Greek and the Lexicons; as these are the foundation of all verbal criticisms of the New Testament. Hence, in the use of them, I was "*only on the Bible foundation*."

(9.) On page 37, of your book, and in the third paragraph, *you assume*, as if from me, that "Moses had a clear idea of the soul's immortality."

And yet, the sermons in which I spoke, exclusively on the subject of Moses, (and heard by you on Sept. 14, 1862, and April 16, 1869,) contain these words, viz., "We *infer* from the language of Moses, that he believed in another life; and yet, there is no positive proof that the Old Testament teaches immortal life."

(10.) Again. You have employed the best libraries in town, (and one of them at your second door neighbors, belonging to a clergyman,) and have received books by express from another source. And yet you represent to *the public*, and have so inferred it on page 5, of your book, that all your labors in this discussion are from a very *small library*.

(11.) You represent also, (both in and out of your pamphlet,) that it is *you*—Miss L. A. Prouty—a feeble woman *alone*, that is contending with Mr. Foster. And yet *in you* I have to meet several (so called) Orthodox ministers.

That I am right in these foregoing statements, is evident, *first*, from your own admission on page 5, of your book, that *you have no Greek Lexicons*, which is pretty good proof that you never stud-

ied Greek; and yet, in your next letter you profess to understand the Greek "*aionion*" and attempt to hew it into *Orthodox* shape.

Second, it requires but very little scholarship, and but little knowledge of Greek for a person to see in all your letters where you try to handle "*aion*," that you are like a person on *crutches*. It is fully evident from your letters, that all you have been able to do with "*aion*" is from another's hand, and that you have tried to fit it in as a part of *your* work, and the jumbling use you have made of it is positive proof of your outside help from clergymen, and of your self-conceit.

Oh! what an effort to gain your point, even at the sacrifice of Inspiration!

Now, here is an amount of *misrepresentation*, to which, I am confident, you cannot find an *equal*, even in the advertisements of patent medicine humbugs.

Remember, the guilt of the patent medicine proprietor is simply the *falsification* of a *spurious mixture*, and to gain the money trash of this world.

But the foregoing quantity of misrepresentation is about the solemn realities of faith, and the endless destiny of undying souls.

And it is affirmed simply to gain a sarcastic victory in the discussion of so terrible a question, as the "*endless misery of some of our race*."

WE WILL NOW EXAMINE A SMALL AMOUNT OF YOUR MORAL DISHONESTY IN FALSIFICATION.

(1.) Your pamphlet comes to the public entitled "The entire correspondence between E. S. Foster and L. A. Prouty."

Here is the discussion labelled with a falsehood. It is not "the *entire* correspondence." You have withheld your first letter, which advised Mrs. W. how to proceed in taking the inclosed articles of agreement to me.

This can be proved by more than one witness. I have not inserted it, for the reason that I have mislaid or destroyed it, not thinking that I was to deal with a *dishonest professor*.

Again. My letter of Nov. 16, 1869, which is all about your reply to *the Discussion*, and which is published in this book, was also withheld.

(2.) Consider your compliance with the articles of agreement.

The 2d article reads as follows, viz., "Any part of this discussion may be made public, previous to its completion, if both parties shall so consent."

Now, when it was completed, I inquired of you, in the letter of Sept. 9th, 1869, as to *how* and *when* you would have it published, and if "you would pay one half of publication."

All the notice you took of this was to write a reply to the Discussion, and unknown to me, have it published to suit yourself.

Thus you willfully denied and broke the agreement.

But *suppose* your reply was a part of said Debate, a common school boy of small intellect and years, could see at once, that it *demand*ed my response to finish the contest.

Hence, on this ground, you broke the bond between us. And, in the face of this *dishonesty*, you published a part of said Discussion—published *just enough* as you *vainly thought* to insure a boasting victory.

Now, what must we think of a person, who so willfully betrays the trust placed in her, on so solemn a subject as the soul's immortal destiny?

What can we think of one who will so violate the agreement written and signed by her own hand?

(3.) The 3d article of our agreement reads as follows, viz., "After its close, this discussion may be made public by either party, without consent of the other, provided that no part thereof be omitted."

Instead of keeping this agreement, you have published some of the letters between us, as parts of said Debate, and have withheld your first letter and my last, which materially change the appearance of the Debate.

Then you have added a *reply*, as a part of said Discussion. And you have had the whole printed without my assent or knowledge, and withheld from me the privilege of correcting my proof-sheets.

Now, I will *defy* you to produce a parallel of *baseness*, equal to *this, in print*.

How stands your case here in the court of *Society*?

(4.) You promised, on page 81 of your book, to send me the proof-sheets, that I might correct my manuscripts.

And *this you never did*.

An old adage says that "there is honor among thieves."

But, when a professing Christian woman attempts to defame a minister of another faith, how stands the case?

(5.) On the 11th page of your book, and in the 1st and 2d paragraphs, will be seen, that I *only* referred to Dr. Adam Clark on the *second coming of Christ*, "in his kingdom in power, in glory and with his angels." See Matt. x : 23 ; xvi : 27, 28 ; xxiii : 36, and xxiv : 34.

Hence, your statement, on page 18, and in 3d paragraph, is positively incorrect.

And, on page 29, of your book, and in bottom paragraph, you willfully re-affirm the *untruth*, in asserting that I claimed Dr. A. Clark as explaining 2 Thess. i : 7 to 10, as do Universalists.

That I am correct, turn to page 12, and, in the bottom paragraph, will be seen that I referred *only* to Drs. Hammond, Gill, and Bishop Cappe, as explaining the said text as do Universalists.

(6.) On page 16, of your book, and in the first two lines, you say, that I argue that, "because the thing revealed is beyond my understanding, therefore it cannot be true."

Any one acquainted with our *faith* and its literature, will pronounce this statement utterly destitute of truth.

And, on page 31, and in the first paragraph, you *deliberately re-affirm* the misrepresentation.

(7.) On p. 31 of your book, and in 2d paragraph, you affirm that the question—"Can you understand how such a thing can be?"—is a common argument among Universalists, and used by them to prove a thing *untrue* which is beyond our knowledge.

Now that you are incorrect here is evident, from the fact, that the *question* is, in no sense, an *argument*.

Again, Universalists never argue in this manner, and consider it foolish so to do. You cannot produce a single instance.

(8.) The case of the Townshend lady, (mentioned on p. 30,) you bring forward as saying, "she would not believe what she

could not understand;" and you affirm that this is the same as saying, "that because the thing revealed is beyond our knowledge therefore it cannot be true."

Now, the *utter want of equality* in the above statements, *proves the mistake*. The Townshend lady will soon understand your professions.

(9.) On page 67, and in 3d paragraph, you state that "you have not reasoned about (Universalists, 'aion,' and our proof of truth,) in a circle."

And yet, on page 44, and from Bishop Whately, you are proved untruthful.

(10.) On page 17, and in third paragraph, you say that "Orthodox Christians consider that the phrase, 'coming of Christ,' is used in five different senses in the New Testament, none of them referring to the destruction of Jerusalem."

And yet on page 30, and in the second paragraph you say, "I am aware that the coming of Christ," mentioned in a few texts of Matt. and in some of the epistles, is by Clark referred to the destruction of Jerusalem."

Here, in this second statement, you falsify your first assertion. And the Orthodox Doctors, Hammond and Gill, confirm the same on you.

Now look *again* at these *ten untruths*, and some of them *re-affirmed*, and notice that they are brought forward to disprove the final redemption, and to sustain the supposed "*endless misery*."

Is it possible that this *heathen doctrine* has come to this *terrible strain* for existence?

(11.) On p. 19, and in third paragraph, you say "that influential preachers of Universalism speak of repentance scornfully as a doctrine peculiarly the invention of Orthodox Christians."

In both particulars this statement is *utterly destitute of truth*. All who know us and our theology know that, with great reverence, we preach and believe the great and *absolute necessity* of the *doctrine*, and that it is one of the important steps towards a holy life. And we *know it to be from God and Christ*, not from *Orthodox invention*.

Here you falsify us.

I would you could receive the power of Jesus' words, where he says, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

(12.) On page 32, of your book, and in 4th paragraph, you state "that Universalists define repentance, as making no change of character necessary, and with or without its exercise "the black-hearted and red-handed assassin and traitor, together with his noble and pure minded and patriotic victim, enter upon the bliss of Heaven."

And this statement you say "you are well able to prove," which is the same as telling a falsehood, and then swearing to it. You cannot prove from profession, literature, or preaching, that Universalists ever did so believe or teach.

We believe that all will repent, and that the Heaven where all souls will finally arrive, is beyond universal repentance, and all the consequences of sin.

(13.) On page 33, and in 3d paragraph, you define "*aion*" as always denoting the longest duration of which the thing referred to is capable.

This you say, I *deny*. And then you quote my definition, viz., "it always denotes a time limited by its connection."

Now, the parallel between these two definitions, proves the mistake on you. This shows conclusively that your jumbled mess about "*aion*" is from *another source*, than *your careful study*.

(14.) On page 41, from your own quotation on logic, and from Bishop Whately, on page 42, it is clearly proved that you "*begged the question*." And on page 29, and 4th paragraph, you say "This I have not done." What an emphatic *untruth*!

(15.) On page 9th, it will be seen that in your *first assumption* of the affirmative, all your argument, (so called,) was in *one Bible reference*, (2 Thess. 1: 7-10,) without any comments.

This presentation forced me to *affirm* and *prove* that 2 Thess. 1: 7-10 *belonged to another subject*, than the proof of "*endless misery*."

Then you followed, and *denied my explanation*, and said Mr. Foster argued in this case in the negative. Here you *misrepresented* me.

(16.) On page 15, of your book, you declare that Universalists "distribute the meaning of '*aion*' and its derivatives very skill-

fully ; making it mean *endless* when connected with *future happiness*, but when connected with any *threatening to the wicked*, then it means *age*, life, or dispensation."

And on pages 22, 23, I have fully shown the incorrectness of your statement.

Yet, on page 31 and in last paragraph, you say you "will not retract," *the statement*. This is re-affirming a great mistake.

Here is another proof of your outside help on the Greek "*aion*," for you go *blundering* along with it, like a man *in liquor*. When you get hold of it, you seem to have no idea where you will bring up—whether against the *fence* of the *noun*, or the wallowings of desire, passion and self-conceit.

(17.) On page 61, and in 4th art. you state that I "agreed at the beginning to discuss *two questions with you*."

This is another untruth. You cannot prove from the manuscript, nor from verbal evidence, that I ever made any such agreement.

But, *suppose* I did so agree, (which is not the case,) what were the conditions of the discussion ?

In my first and second letters they will be found very explicitly stated. Please turn and read them on pp. 3 and 7. The sum of them is in these words, viz.:

"This labor of the discussion must be with a sincere desire and prayer for the good of us both, and the highest welfare of undying souls around us. I must at all times hold you to the test of the soul's final destiny. It is a serious subject, and one not to be trifled with."

Such were *some* of the conditions. And at any time when these were broken, I had the *right* to close all further discussion.

Now, examine any letter of yours, and it will be fully seen, that not any part of the foregoing conditions have been filled by you, in prayer, spirit, or practice. Hence I was under no obligations to proceed with the debate after the letter of June 4, 1869.

(18.) Again. Being in the *negative*, I also had the *right* of *closing* the discussion unless previously arranged differently, by mutual consent. All this is in perfect keeping with *Parliamentary rules*. And yet, you say, on page 61, that we have not yet closed the first question. Such is your perversion.

(19.) All through the *discussion*, you required me to *affirm* and *show* that your Scripture references *belonged* to, and *proved* other subjects than your question of "*endless misery*."

Then you followed in the *denial* nearly all the way through.

This is assuming and declaring the negative, when you *pledged* to sustain the affirmative. Hence you effectually acted out the deceiver.

(20.) All through the Debate, you have failed,—*utterly failed*, to take up your *selected question* and support it. And only have attempted a reply and denial of my argument. This is effectually *begging the question* again, according to *your logicians*, and arguing negatively.

And on page 29, and in the third paragraph, you say, "*this I have not done*."

Now, is it *possible* to make a clearer statement of falsehood?

And to *clinch* this *untruth* (with brazen face), you said on page 64, and in second paragraph, "*Yes, sir, I promised you that I should prove your arguments false, and intend to do so still*."

Here in these last *ten falsehoods*, is a *dishonesty*, which would require *great searching* to find a parallel even among *gamblers*.

(21.) On page 29, of your book, in the 5th paragraph, you say, that "*your three propositions*," on page 9, "*said yes* to the question under debate."

This is *not true*; for the two first propositions have nothing (really) to do with *endless misery* or the final redemption. They belong as much to Universalism, as to Orthodoxy.

(22.) Again. On page 29, you state that "*the whole of your letter of July 3, 1869, said yes* to the question under discussion."

And yet, on page 14, and in the last paragraph but one, you "*deny the use made of 'aionion,' by objecting to the rendering*." And the said letter is simply a denial of my argument.

Still untruthful.

(23.) On page 29, and in 5th paragraph, you still add, that "*my letter of July 15th said no* to the same question."

Read that letter, on page 20, and its substance consists in seven affirmations, viz.,—

In affirming and proving that you argue in the negative, by denying my explanation of Scripture.

Consists in affirming and proving that "*aion*" and its derivatives, from the learned, belongs to and proves something else than endless misery.

Consists in affirming and proving that "*aion*" is to be defined by the *noun* to which it belongs.

Consists in affirming and proving that your statement about Adam Clark, *is* incorrect.

Consists in affirming and proving the phrase, "*unquenchable fire*" from the Scripture, as meaning *something else*, than *endless misery*.

Consists in affirming and proving the *Bible conditions of salvation*.

Consists in affirming and proving that your continual method of "*begging the question*" by continual abandonment of the affirmative, forced me into these affirmations.

Here are seven proofs of your willful prevarication.

(24.) On page 37, and in art. 7, you emphatically declare the *twenty-one Bible conditions of salvation*—"no conditions."

This is profaning twenty-one Scripture texts.

Then you immediately add,—"*I do find something said* about being punished according to the fruit of one's doings, (Jer. xxi: 14,) and that the end and object of God's law is to convert the soul (Ps. xix: 7,) which hint Orthodox conditions."

(25.) On page 62 of your book, you affirm that you have known Mrs. P. to be a Universalist for twelve years, and that she was thus educated from a child.

And at the same time you *knew better*, for Mrs. P. had admitted to you within the time, that "Orthodoxy seemed much nearer the correct faith than Universalism." Mrs. P. has this fact in your letter.

And the said lady will unqualifiedly affirm that she was not a Universalist, and doubted the sublime truths, till she saw her much loved and honored mother through the ravages of sickness, and death.

Through these *trying* scenes, she saw the glories of this *great Faith bear her dear mother to the life immortal*.

"Then," says Mrs. P., "I could no longer doubt the truth of Universalism." This was seven years ago.

Since then, you have crowded yourself upon her in written discussion. And you have met her plain, honest replies and argument, with cant, sarcasm, misrepresentation and ridicule.

Hence, *here you are in an untruth.*

(26.) Again, on page 62, and in first paragraph, you state, that the "discussion between you and Mrs. P. was in the spirit of love and kindness."

I am permitted by the lady to say "*this is not the case;*" and your letters to her prove you incorrect. And the said lady and myself are not the *only persons*, misused and falsified at your hands.

The personal and living evidence is ready for you at any time.

(27.) On page 64, and in 3d paragraph, you say, that "the fallacy which Bishop Whately condemns is not the employment of references, but the dishonest introduction of references not pertaining to the subject."

Turn to page 4, and in 4th paragraph, Bishop Whately proves your assertion *false*, and that you are still the sophist and deceiver. And most of your quotations have no reference to the subject for which you bring them forward.

This is *emphatic* proof of *your misrepresentation.*

(28.) On page 65, you say, "you have not discussed as you agreed, and have brought in forty-four authors, that I should regard as authoritative books of reference." And yet, *I have only argued from the Bible with its foundation—the Greek and the Lexicons.* And to argue "*from the Bible foundation only*" would be to argue from the *Greek and Hebrew.* This I have *emphatically* done; and only brought in the *Commentators* and other learned authors, as *collateral evidence* and *proof* that I was right. Hence here you are in an error, and willfully reaffirmed also.

(29.) On page 67, and in the 6th paragraph, you say, "you are happy to see that I at last agree with you in regard to the force of 'aion' and its derivatives."

What a statement! Notice, I was *first* in using "*aion*" as the *Bible foundation* of the words—"everlasting, eternal and forever;" was *first* in giving its definitions from the learned; was *first* to

abide by them. And no one can detect any change in my use of all connected with it, from beginning to end.

On the other hand, *you* was *last* in the examination, *last* in the denial, and *last* in the negative reply in your *last* (so called) argument, concerning "*aion*" on page 33 of the Debate.

Wherever you come to this word "*aion*," you act like a boy with a hot iron in his hand.

What a strain to prove your boastful ability and learning. And what a falsehood to prove *endless misery*.

(30.) On page 75, you affirm, that the first Universalist sermon, viz., "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," (which was preached to Eve in the Garden,) *is not preached by Universalists in any sense that deters men from sin.*

Now, all Universalists preach, clearly and emphatically, the *certainty of punishment for all sin*. The Patriarchs, Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles *did so preach*, and this preaching has saved millions on millions in ages past, and is saving thousands in the present age. Nature presents the same certainty of punishment for sin in her every department.

Here inspiration and nature prove you in an untruth.

(31.) On page 75, and in last line but two, you declare that "Orthodoxy does not fail to reform."

Now, the *fact* that nearly all drunkards, gamblers, profane men and Sabbath breakers are *believers in "endless misery,"* proves the *untruth*.

Again. The *fact* from *absolute statistics* that most, if not all the inmates of the prisons, in this country and in Europe, are *believers in the Orthodox hell*, proves your *assertion false*.

(32.) On page 76, and in the 7th paragraph, you state, that "if a man is converted to *Orthodoxy* he will at once reform."

The statistics of crime in every town, city and country, prove the untruth of this statement; for nearly all criminals are *believers in endless torture*.

(33.) On page 77, of your book, and in first paragraph, you say, "that Universalism offers a premium to *deliberate suicide*."

Now, the good, pious and great of all denominations, attribute suicide to *insanity*, and not to Universalism.

How stands the truth of your statement in the case of a good Orthodox deacon in Springfield, Vt., who attempted it? How does the truth stand in the case of Rev. N. P. Campfield, formerly of Casanovia, N. Y.—an Orthodox minister—made insane by a belief in *endless misery*, and, who threw himself into the Connecticut River, near Bellows Falls, in the fall of 1868? And his father or father-in-law (an Orthodox minister) considered it *no crime*, for he affirmed that there was no doubt but that he had gone to Heaven.

You can obtain these facts from the neighbors near where the body was recovered.

Again, take the Bible argument in the case of Samson, (mentioned in Heb. xi: 32,) *a suicide*, and the proof from *all quarters* is overwhelming against you in the *falsehood*.

(34.) You said in braggadocio style, "That if you could not convince Mr. Foster in the defense of your question, you would get some fun out of it."

You said this to Mrs. W. and to more than *one witness*.

Yet, emphatically, on page 62, you deny this, and challenge me to prove it.

Query. If it took *only three falsehoods* to sink Peter to the place where Jesus called him a Satan, how stands your case?

The reader (without doubt) has been looking and *wondering* where in the "*slough of Despond*," the boasting and satirical Miss Prouty will finally bring up.

WE WILL NOW LOOK AT SOME OF YOUR FALSIFICATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

First. On page 35, of your book, and in second paragraph, you affirm "that *not one of the Epistles was addressed to unconverted persons*."

"*Was not addressed*."—The external evidence that you are *incorrect*, is the fact that each epistle is respectively addressed as

follows, viz., "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the"—Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philipians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and Hebrews.

The Epistles of Peter are addressed as follows, viz. "The Epistle general of Peter." And John's and Jude's Epistles are addressed in the same manner.

The learned, and all commentators, allow these *superscriptions to be correct and so use them.*

Now these addresses are vastly different from what should be the salutations to organized Churches, or to special circles of the consecrated.

Therefore your assertion is *untrue* in the *Address of the Epistles.*

But the internal evidence is against you.

Paul to the Romans, *ii*: 21, 22, says: "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preacheest, A man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest, A man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?"

Again. *iii*: 9, 10, 11, 12. "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin. As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable: there is none that doeth good, no, not one."

Paul said to the Corinthians, 1 Epistle, *xv*: 22: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" And in 34th verse, "Awake to righteousness and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God. I speak this to your shame."

Surely these words are to the *unconverted.*

Paul to the Galatians *iii*: 1, says, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" And you will find much more of same kind in Gal. *ii*.

Paul says to the Ephesians v : 14, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ will give thee light.

This is evidently to the *unconverted*.

Paul says to the Philippians, i : 15, "Some indeed preach Christ of envy and strife." And in verse 16, "The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds."

This is addressing the *unconverted*.

Paul says to the Colossians, ii : 20, "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?"

Here it is seen that some of the Colossians were Judaizing teachers, "after the commandments and doctrines of men," verse 22.

Paul to the Thessalonians says, v : 14, "Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all men."

Paul, in his 2d Epistle to Thessalonians, iii : 11, says, "For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies."

The address here is to the *unconverted*, which very strongly resembled the one who pledged to support the affirmative in the Discussion.

In 1 Timothy i : 6, 7, are these words, viz., "From which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm."

These are *unconverted* persons. Do not these words describe the character of the affirmative in the Debate?

Again. 1 Timothy ii. "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty: for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."

Do these words simply pray for the converted,—for Timothy

and his followers? Is not the exhortation given to pray for *all men*? Does not this prayer include the *unconverted*?

We find these words in 2 Timothy, 11: 25, 26: "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will."

These are to the *unconverted*.

Epistle to Titus, 1: 10, 11. "For there are many unruly and vain talkers, and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake."

In Hebrews are these words, 12, 13: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do."

Again. Heb. viii: 10, 11. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest."

Again. Heb. xii: 4, 5. "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin. And ye have forgotten the exhortation, which speaketh unto you, as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him."

In the Epistle of James are these words, viz., 11: 6, "Ye have despised the poor."

Again. James iv: 1, 2, 3, 4. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have

not, because ye ask not. Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. Ye adulterers, and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world, is the enemy of God."

In 1 Ep. Peter, 11: 7, "Unto you, therefore, which believe, he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner."

In 2 Peter 1: 9, "But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins." Again, 11: 1, 2, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways: by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of."

In 3 Ep. John 9 and 10 verses, are the words, "I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preëminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church."

The foregoing texts are some of the internal proof that the Epistles were addressed to unconverted persons.

To sustain your *self-conceited will* in the Discussion, you have not hesitated to descend to the disgraceful affirmation—"not one of the Epistles was addressed to unconverted persons."

This is emphatically charging Paul, James, Peter and John, and each of their Epistles, with *falsehood*.

And here are no less than *sixteen untruths*, given with a boasting willfulness against *Inspiration*.

And to answer you in every possible direction on this subject, suppose that the Epistles were addressed to the *Churches* in the places named, does this prove any thing to clear you from the im-

mense guilt? *Not at all!* For in those churches, or the *circles addressed*, were all classes of character, as shown from quotations.

And Bishop Horne (an Orthodox divine), in his "Introduction to a critical knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," bears *full testimony*, in his examination of the Epistles, to the truth of my position. See Horne on the Epistles.

Not satisfied with this strain on the Apostles, you advance upon the blessed Saviour; and on page 16, of your book, in art. 3, you affirm that "Christ himself expressly declared that he would not come at the destruction of Jerusalem," (See Matt. xxiv: 23 to 27.)

Now, by turning to these references, it will be seen that you charge Christ with untruth.

And to prove you incorrect, we give you Jesus' own words, in reply to his disciples' question, in Matt. xxiv: 3, "Tell us, when shall these things be?" Jesus answered, in Matt. x: 23, "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come. Matt. xvi: 27, 28, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels: and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Matt. xxiii: 36. "Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." And the next verse begins in these words, viz.: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, &c."

Now, I cannot conceive of a plainer and more direct answer to the disciples' question.

That Christ came before *some* to whom he spake suffered death, came during that generation, came at the destruction of Jerusalem, came in power, in glory, with his angels, and in his Kingdom, is proved also by some of the best scholars, of all denominations.

And yet, you falsify them, as well as the blessed Redeemer.

THE SARCASM-UNTRUTHS.

On page 62, and in 2d paragraph, you assert, that, *you "have not uttered sarcasm when actually speaking of serious things."*

And your Orthodox Webster defines sarcasm to be "keen reproachful expression—to deride, or sneer at."

Now, in view of the awful question of *endless misery*, which you promised to support, I made (on page 6,) this remark, viz., "I am glad Calvinism, in Chester, has one brave heart, with sufficient moral strength, intellect and real ability, to attempt its defense.

And I said *this*, with a deep, serious consciousness of what I supposed was your character, in view of such a question.

But on page 8, you reply, "I deem it in bad taste, to say the least, for you to express yourself in such terms, either to me, or to the public, as I am informed you did on a late occasion."

This is *sarcasm*, to my honest opinion of you at that time, in connection with the very serious subject, *endless punishment*. I verily thought I was stating *the truth* about you. But your comments virtually deny the possession of such a character; and the discussion shows the correctness of your denial, and that *I was mistaken*.

And on page 62, you call my foregoing remark, "a *fulsome compliment*," which I understand from Webster, to mean "a *gross and disgusting mistake*." I am *very sorry*, I did so *misrepresent* you.

On page 10, of your book, I said "I am sorry you did not at once select your question, and fill up your communication with argument, in defense of what you believe to be truth."

To this you reply, on page 13, "If it is any privilege to you to criticise my style, you have my permission to enjoy it to the full. I may, hereafter, furnish you still further material for the exercise of your criticism."

Here is sarcasm to my sincere statement.

On pp. 11 and 12, I explained 2 Thess. 1: 7 to 10, as belonging to some other subject than "*endless misery*;" which was a serious explanation and before a serious subject.

You reply on page 14, thus viz., "Well, that text cost you just six pages of writing, and will cost you more unless you surrender it!"

Here is sarcasm with a vengeance.

On page 12, and in bottom paragraph, I referred you to Drs. Hammond, Gill and Bishop Cappe (and these only), as explaining 3 Thess. 1: 7 to 10, as do Universalists.

To which you reply on page 18, by quoting Adam Clark on 2 Thess. 1: 7 to 10, as a burlesque edification to me. And then you add, "Verily sir, I think you must understand Adam Clark by 'the rule of contrary.'"

Here is sarcasm to a serious reference upon a serious subject.

On page 20 of your book, will be found my letter of July 16, 1869, given in plain, honest statement, and kind spirit.

But on page 29, of your book, you began your letter by saying that, "your late kind and courteous epistle was duly received, has been carefully read, and sufficiently admired. I will reply to the best of my benighted powers."

Here is *sarcasm*, given against a serious subject, handled in a serious manner.

On page 20 I prove that you begged the question, and forced me into the affirmative. To which, on page 29, you reply, "had you written a text book, on logic, some years since, I might possibly have learned your somewhat peculiar views upon these things."

Here is *willful* and *bombastio sarcasm* to my honest proof, that you begged the question.

On page 23 of your book, I explain clearly that you was mistaken in affirming "that I referred to Adam Clark as explaining 2 Thess. 1: 7 to 10, as do Universalists."

To which you reply on page 30, "I think, sir, that had you candidly acknowledged that, through haste, or other sufficient cause, you had failed to give your meaning as you intended it, it would have savored quite as much of Christian courtesy, as to accuse me of misrepresentation." Here is *contemptuous sarcasm*, to a pleasant statement of the facts.

On page 22, your affirmation "that Universalists distribute the meaning of "*aion*" and its derivatives skillfully," I pronounced a bold, unfortunate and untrue statement. To which, on page 30, you reply, "there is nothing at all original in this; they are but

stereotyped expressions of Universalists' opinions of us all." Here is sarcasm and misrepresentation.

In the closing argument of the Discussion, I conclusively proved from your own logician, and from Bishop Whately, that you begged the question which you promised to prove. And it was the serious question of *endless misery*.

And on page 64, you reply to my *whole proof* in these words, viz., "your use of Bishop Whately forcibly suggests that celebrated piece of literature, the sermon on the text, "*He played on a harp of a thousand strings.*"

This is evading the support of *your chosen question*—the serious and awful subject of *endless misery*, with *superlative* and *comic sarcasm*.

And to all of these, and some twenty-five more cases of the kind, you have said on page 62, that you have *not used sarcasm* when actually speaking of serious things."

Not only in this calumny of Dr. Whately, but through all of this reply to the Discussion, you seem possessed with some of *the spirits*," which the preacher of your celebrated sermon, "*had for sale on his flat boat.*"

And if the immortal Whately *knew* that his thoroughly studied principle of scripture logic, had been thus contested by an Orthodox Church member, with *fusion satire*, I verily believe that he would think that a second Mary Magdalene, with a multiplication of her evil spirits, had come upon his earthly work.

Again. You say on page 62, and in 2d paragraph, "When a man violates the courtesies of debate by using language personally abusive, he merits no other than sarcasm in reply.

And yet, from the commencement to the close of the Debate, it can be seen, that you began "*the personally abusive language and sarcasm*, and against all entreaty, continued it, and defied me to meet you in it. And only in the close of the Discussion, did I make any advance to meet your nefarious comments and sarcasm.

And my short answer to your long defiance, you style, "*abusive language and meriting nothing but sarcasm.*"

Look over the *mass* of your *insolent invective*, see how it is the sum of your effort. Suppose I had been guilty of the same unprincipled and vicious satire to you, and against all your entreaties to be honest and devoted, what then would be your definition?

Again. Look at that statement, viz., "When a man violates the courtesies of debate by using language personally abusive, he merits no other than sarcasm in reply."

What a fulsome and conceited assumption! How it misrepresents me and yourself! For, you was the first and only one, who violated all rules of courtesy and respectability in the Debate, and against the original agreement, written by yourself.

And you began and continued the violation, from your second letter to your last; in all of which you defied me to measure swords with you.

And all of your *last reply* in that Discussion is but in keeping with your continual demand.

Hence, in my sharp replies, I only met your challenge; I only complied with your requirement—the rules of character which you claimed, and claimed too, just as a highway robber says to the traveler, "your money sir, or your life."

Now, if a *professing* woman, who claims respectability, and boasts of great learning, will *challenge* a minister, to discuss the awful question of *endless misery*, for the purpose of *defaming* him, and "*gaining some fun out of it*," what must we think of her? What does she merit?

If a woman of such claims, and assisted by several Orthodox ministers, will so degrade herself by a low billingsgate style of argument, and cling to it (against much advice), from beginning to end, on so solemn a question as the *soul's destiny*, and then defy her opponent with it, what does she merit?

If one of such *boasted abilities*, will descend to *misrepresentation*, *falsification* and *sarcasm*, and hold herself willfully to these, all through such a *debate*, what does she merit?

And, if beyond all this, she will misrepresent the *Discussion*, her opponent and herself, the Epistles and Apostles, and our Saviour also, then, *what does she merit*?

Again. On page 62, and in the last sentence of the 2d paragraph, you say, *You "intend to lay the whole of my abusive language under the table unanswered."*

And, in the very next paragraph, you strike at me with a superlative mis-statement and an insolent invective. And the untruth in the said paragraph, is proved on you from Mrs. H—— W—— and Miss —— H—— and Mr. T—— W——.

Your last letter is evidently not a support of your selected question of "*endless misery*," but a satirical reply to the whole foregoing Discussion.

And yet, you palm it off upon society, as a rightful and logical reply to my closing argument. Hence you falsify the whole affair—your own position, mine also, and the Discussion.

Reader! can you conceive of a tougher piece of material to contend with?

Now, for a moment, look at *this mass of moral dishonesty*,—seventy-five plain and direct, and willful misrepresentations and untruths, (and these are by no means all,) within forty-six pages of your printed book.

And then, you labeled *the Discussion* with a *falsehood*, (by leaving out your *first* and my *last* letter,) and all to support the awful question—"Does the Bible teach the endless misery of any one of our race?" I frankly acknowledge, that *I* know of no *parallel* among ancient or modern writers. It is a mass of baseness and depravity which the most execrable amongst us (I fully believe) cannot be hired for love and money to *father*.

Let any one (who is a disinterested believer) read you from first to last, and your replies will be acknowledged a string of sarcastic cuts and thrusts,—and all to plead the mythical "*endless misery*."

On reception of your second letter, I was astonished and disgusted; but, when told by some of our best citizens, (whose evidence I am ready to give,) that you had made sarcasm and discussion your favorite themes of study, I thought best to pass the *misfortune*, and over it throw the veil of charity.

And, up to the closing reply of the Debate, I allowed (with

much effort) all to pass,—thinking you would see the unchristian course, be disgusted with, and quit it. But it seemed to be the bread of life to you, and *in* it, and *with* it, you literally drove me to the *wall*, and then *defied* me to meet you. Forbearance then ceased to be a *virtue*, hence in the close of the Discussion, I indulged in the smallest possible amount needed to ward off your cuts.

You seem desirous, at all times, to crowd yourself and your conceited religious discussion upon certain respectable persons.

And your first approach in the *discussions* is to prevaricate, then to taunt the evidence presented, and then you scandalize the opponents and their arguments. Wherever you take up a point, it seems not for an examination, candidly and prayerfully; but to misrepresent and tantalize, and then ridicule what you cannot otherwise contemptibly meet.

All, who do not agree with your erratic views (whether in or out of your denomination), do not escape your venom.

Your system of discussion is but a guerrilla warfare. Any means but honor and principle, you grasp *fanatically*, to accomplish your end.

You hesitate not, at meeting honest and scripture faith with low blackguard and to discuss *endless misery*, "*for the fun you will get out of it.*"

That I am correct, I will here say that I have ascertained from reliable authority, that Mrs. P. of Chester, and Mrs. L———, of Andover, Vermont, are not the only ladies whom you have misrepresented and falsified.

It seems that your whole study, aim and disposition is to be meddlesome and to be in a brawling gossip, especially on religious matters. *Nothing* appears *too sacred* for the probe of your *perversion* and *satire*.

All, that is worth gaining to you, seems not to be holiness—a Christ-like life—but the might of your *conceited will* and *invective*.

And in all with whom you have had discussions your character is cut in insolent speech, spirit, and conceited vanity.

With these, and nearly all others with whom you have business, you seem to have earned the name of a *misanthrope*. And the living of this character, you vainly think is defending Orthodox religion.

And if any one calumniated at your hands, presents a self-defence, then you go prating—"I am persecuted for righteousness' sake." With *you*, the Christian life seems a *burlesque*.

Now, to profess a sixteen years' conversion, and push the terrible question of *endless misery* upon any one for discussion, and treat that *debate* with sarcasm, fallacy and sophistry, is knavish.

To challenge a clergyman to discuss this *awful question*, and pledge to do it with candor and prayer, then meet the whole subject in rowdy satire, is anything but honest and noble. It is what St. James calls "earthly, sensual, devilish." James III: 14, 15.

To make out a *false account* of the Discussion, as you did, contrary to your agreement and to respectability, and then take the manuscripts, without any legal right, and have them printed in a deceptive manner, is felonious.

And of *all evidence* yet presented, your effort *in and with the Discussion*, is the *best proof*, that I have ever seen, of the fabled *total depravity*.

MISS PROUTY'S POSITION AT THE OPENING OF HER REPLY TO THE DISCUSSION.

After obtaining the assistance of several Orthodox clergymen, in order to meet Mr. Foster, and trying to make the public believe that it is only *one feeble woman*, with a very small library, that is doing the work, this does not satisfy your thirst for the ignoble and untrue.

After breaking the 2d and 3d articles of the agreement (written by your own hand), trampling on the promise to be prayerful and candid, and treating the whole debate with contumelious satire, your venomous desire is not satisfied. And contrary to all Parliamentary rules of debate (and after the Discussion was finished) you make a reply to the whole discussion, and add it to the

Debate as a part of it, and then have it printed in opposition to all rules of Christian courtesy and honor.

And to justify yourself in this ignoble course, you say on page 61, and in art. 3, that you "deny the right of the negative to *dictate* when the discussion shall close."

And yet, Parliamentary rules concede this right to the negative, unless otherwise mutually arranged. And as we had no other arrangement, the closing belonged to me; but you *stole it*, and then *secretly appropriated it to your use*.

Again. You say "in all courts, the plaintiff has the closing plea."

Now, according to your assumption (and sarcastically defended), I am the challenging party, and virtually the plaintiff. And you make it appear *thus*, by leaving out your first letter from your book. Then, according to your *willful position in the beginning*, I had the right of closing.

But suppose it otherwise. In our courts, the plaintiff throws up soul and body, and contends for *his will*, in the loss and gain of worldly matters.

This, is just your situation in the Debate. You *fought for your will* in misrepresentation and sarcasm, rather than studied to know the great and sublime truths for the soul's salvation.

Again. In our courts, the plaintiff attempts to prove the defendant false or guilty. And *this* is just what you acted out, though you chose the affirmative and agreed to support it.

But, there is no parallel between the customs of our courts, and Parliamentary *discussions*.

For in all well arranged *debates* and *lyceum discussions*, the business of the affirmative is not to prove the negative false or guilty, but to set up the *affirmation* of the question and defend it.

And our question was a very different *thing* from a neighborhood quarrel (though you strove with your might to make it such), where a person fights for his *will*, in the right and wrong between man and man.

Again. Our *question*, concerning the soul's final destiny, was for *you to prove*, and for me to show that your reasoning was without foundation. Thus, our relations *to it*, were directly the opposite, of the relations between the *plaintiff* and *defendant*, in a common court.

Hence, even the *figure* which you brought up, to justify you in the *dishonest course*, declares *against you*.

Now, you as a converted and devoted believer in the devil's doctrine of an endless hell for some of our race, chose your own *question* and the *affirmative*, and promised to sustain it, which must have been very pleasing to the devil, had you kept the agreement for him.

Yes, you pledged to argue for the endless misery of immortal souls, which must be in direct opposition to Christ, who argues and pleads continually for the salvation of all men.

In that Debate, I argued for the salvation of *all souls*, in harmony with our Saviour's *pleadings* for universal redemption.

You reasoned in harmony with your imagined Devil's life and doctrine, and even with his style and spirit, as near as I can learn from your best divinity writers.

I labored in keeping with unlimited grace, and in accordance with Christ's declaration, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." John XII: 32.

You strove for *endless misery*, against all the prayers of *all the righteous* who have ever lived, as they prayed for the salvation of *all men*.

Now, if the Devil thinks you made *slim work* in arguing for his *kingdom* and *subjects*, he will certainly award you immense credit for your vicious sarcasm, and the mass of misrepresentation and falsehoods.

A LOOK AT SOME OF THE RANDOM THINGS OF THE REPLY.

On page 61, you say, "if your discussion has converted Mr. and Mrs. P. that I can afford to keep you at work." And this of course means to keep you at work in the same depraved conceit, misrepresentation, satire and falsehood.

This abomination and sin no one can afford, for Inspiration declares "God forbid that we should sin that grace may abound." Rom. vi: 1, 2.

Your explanation about the discussion with two Universalist ministers, I accept. I was misinformed.

Yes, rumor has said some strange things about Mr. Foster's stooping so low as to discuss a religious question with a person intrenched in the fort of sarcasm and ridicule, and whose ammunition is misrepresentation and falsehood.

The *inference* I made about certain Universalists in the Congregational and Baptist churches of Chester, is founded on the *fact* that in those churches are persons who *do not believe in endless misery*. I am sure that by canvassing you will find me correct. I can prove my inference by more than *one witness*.

Now, if a person *does not believe in endless misery*, and is silent about the *annihilation of the wicked*, and yet believes in Christ and redemption—such an one is necessarily a Universalist. It is impossible to evade this conclusion.

And this situation of affairs is just what has caused the late commotion in Henry Ward Beecher's Church. And this same thing is rocking the foundation of the Park St. Church in Boston.

In connection with my inference, you ask, "are you (Mr. Foster) not claiming pretty hard characters for Universalists?"

I reply, I do not claim them, they are claimed by the named churches. You call them "hard characters." And yet, they are not so *base and depraved*, as to be hired with *love and money* to be responsible for *only five* of your seventy-five misrepresentations and falsehoods.

On page 65, you do the same as "to accuse me of telling you what the Gospel is according to Ballou, Whittemore and A. C. Thomas. And yet, I have not in any place in the Discussion referred to, or quoted *either* of them; nor have I, during the debate, read anything from them.

On page 63, you state, that I represent a profession of Orthodox creeds as insuring salvation; to which you remark, "nothing can be further from the truth."

And on page 76, and in 2d paragraph, you say, "let that man be converted to Orthodoxy," (which cannot mean anything else than converted to a *profession of Orthodox creeds*,) "he will at *once* reform." And *reformation* is salvation *here* and *hereafter*, and is so admitted by all believers.

Hence, you falsify yourself. That I am correct, is proved from the generally admitted fact, that a *profession of Orthodox creeds*, is received as *prima facie* evidence of conversion.

After all your strain, misrepresentation and sarcasm, about "begging the question," you at last, on page 63, and in 6th paragraph, virtually admit the fact.

The learned authors and commentators in the Orthodox ranks, who (after long years of study and experience) rejected the heathen doctrine of *endless misery*, and whose language I quoted in the Discussion, thus prove that their early lives and writings in the profession of Orthodoxy, were erroneous.

You represent that these lived and died Orthodox; which is *false*, if you mean that they died in the profession of Orthodox creeds.

The apparent difference between my quotation of Dr. Johnson on page 66 and your biographical sketch disappears in the foregoing paragraph.

To show your utter misrepresentation of Dr. Barnes, and your falsification of me, I will quote the whole of Dr. Barnes' paragraph on the subject: Dr. Albert Barnes said, with regard to the attempted solution of the subject of *endless misery*—"I have read to some extent what wise and good men have written. I have looked at theories and explanations. I have endeavored to weigh their arguments; for my whole soul pants for light and relief on these questions. But I get neither, and in the distress and anguish of my own spirit, I confess that I find no light whatever. I see not one ray to disclose to me the reason why I am come into the world; and why man must suffer to all eternity. I never have seen

a particle of light thrown on these subjects that has given a moment's ease to my tortured mind; nor have I an explanation to offer, or a thought to suggest, which would be of relief to you.

I trust other men, as they profess to do, understand this better than I do, and that they have not the anguish of spirit that I have. But I confess, that when I look on a world of sinners and sufferers; upon death-beds and grave-yards; upon the world of woe, filled with hosts to suffer forever; when I see my friends, my parents, my family, my people, my fellow-citizens; when I look upon a whole race, all involved in this sin and danger, and when I see the great mass of them wholly unconcerned, and when I feel that God only can save them, and yet he does not do it, I am struck dumb. It is all dark, dark, dark to my soul, and I cannot disguise it."

Thus you can see that I did not (in my *last reply* of the Discussion,) *divorce* the quotation of Dr. Barnes from its true connection and subject. How *full is the proof* that you do not hesitate, at any time, to falsify the best of scholars, even of your own denomination, to accomplish a base purpose.

Oh! that you could be as honest as the venerable Dr. Barnes.

His whole soul panted for light on this terrible subject, which you conceitedly claim is very plain and that you perfectly understand it and all the proofs of it.

In Dr. Barnes' distress and anguish of spirit, he confessed that he could find no light whatever on this awful subject.

And yet, on page 82, and in 4th paragraph, you say "*the doctrine* is so plainly revealed that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

What an estimate of Dr. Barnes and all his great scholarship! What a superlative profanation of Holy Writ!

My quotation against *endless misery*, in my last reply to the Debate, from Dr. Edward Beecher, (now living in New York State,) you cannot apply to his father—Doctor Lyman Beecher.

What a miserable answer to evade an unwelcome truth, did you apply to the words of Dr. Edward Beecher!

As to Origen,—he is quite a *Ghost* to Orthodoxy, for he haunts its believers on "*aion*," and the ideal *endless misery*. And wherever any professor of *endless misery* attempts to stand on the Greek

platform, he or she verily expect he is under it and will *surely appear*. And *your long expectation of his Ghost*, was sure proof of a guilty conscience, in the bungling use you made of "*aion*."

You represent that there is much difference between the believers of Universalism as taught by Murray and those of to-day.

Now, I will defy you to show *any difference* between them, either in the rendering of God's Holy Word, or on the question of practical religion, or of the final holiness and happiness of all men.

But what a quaking is going on in old Orthodoxy! Verily, to see Rev. W. H. H. Murray, of Boston, tear up its old rotten platform, one would think it was laid over a bottomless pit.

And to behold the quaking that the Brooklyn Plymouth Society is making in the whole Orthodox world, one would verily think that *Orthodoxy* rested on a slumbering volcano.

You ask, "Who are the best Orthodox commentators, as they are scarcely ever heard of." I reply, I have given you some of their names and opinions on the supposed Orthodox texts and words.

The reason, why you and many of your faith have not heard of nor seen them, is because your Publishing Houses will not re-print them, nor allow them circulated. Verily, your house is divided against itself, and Murray of Boston, and Beecher of New York, and Bushnell of Connecticut are pulling the timbers and rubbish down around your heads.

On page 75, and in 8th paragraph, you state that it "was a Universalist who said to you, that there was no need to leave off swearing, according to his belief." This is a willful vilification and untruth; such a person in a sound mind cannot be produced.

Talk about *profane Universalists*! You might as well talk about profane truth and righteousness.

Now, (after *leaving yourself*) one of the boldest and most arrogant defamers of Unlimited Grace, is as profane a man as I know of in all this region. And at the same time, he is one of the most insolent and flippant defenders of Orthodox religion; pays for it, and attends its meeting.

But it would be unjust and unchristian to judge Orthodox religion by such persons.

In this reply of yours to the Discussion, you admit and attempt to handle no less than *fourteen affirmations*, which your begging of the question forced out of me.

And in this same reply, there is no less than *fourteen denials* by you, of my position, and as many attempts to meet me, as if you was regularly in the negative. Is this not actually saying to me in just these words, "you (Mr. Foster) affirm, and I deny."

In this reply, you use the word "*deny*," to my argument, *twice*, with many other negative phrases. And you admit and use for me the word, "*affirm*," three times, with many other phrases of affirmation.

You chose the affirmative; willfully claimed that you supported it; fought with fallacy, misrepresentation and falsehood to prove it. And in your book, you *head* your letters "*Reply*." This is emphatically giving the *lie* to *yourself*.

On page 76, and in the 6th paragraph, you affirm that "Universalist doctrine says to the blackest of criminals, the pirate and murderer, if you continue in sin, if you die with your hands reeking with innocent blood, still you will escape all future punishment."

Now, a more untruthful statement about the teachings of our doctrines, cannot be put together. The Universalist cannot be produced who has ever so believed or so taught. On the contrary we teach most plainly that all such persons will be *fully punished*, either here or hereafter, for all sin.

Then redeemed by the grace of God, which must abound through Jesus Christ as *deeply, extensively, and thoroughly, as sin hath reigned*.

As to Prof. Crosby, you in a defiant manner *misrepresent* him.

The much lamented Dr. Clapp, in his testimony against Orthodoxy, you dismiss with impertinence. He graduated at Yale College, in 1814. In 1817, he graduated at Andover, Mass., and was licensed to preach, the same year, by a Congregational Association.

In 1824, while settled in New Orleans, he was asked by Judge W., of London, to examine the so-called evidences of endless misery in the Bible, and give him a list in Greek and Hebrew. And after ten, long and toilsome years, in Hebrew and Greek, (in 1834) he was compelled to avow his belief in final redemption.

Such is the case of Dr. Clapp, and there are many, many similar ones.

On page 80, and in the first paragraph, you set forth "that the Pharisees' doctrines were, in the main, correct" as Christ himself acknowledged in Matt. xxiii: 2, 3.

Here, is a willful misrepresentation of the Pharisees and of our Saviour.

All the Commentators of all denominations agree, that the phrase "all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you," means "*all things read out of the law and prophets.*" And hence, it has no reference to the *doctrines* of the Pharisees. That the scholars are correct and you are wrong is evident from the fact, that the Old Testament does not teach the doctrine of endless misery.

Again. If your statement is correct about the Pharisees, it is a bold contradiction of all Christ's other teachings, and a misrepresentation of the Pharisees and the Saviour. The Pharisees emphatically taught *total depravity, a personal devil and endless misery*, as the fundamental principles of *their religion*. They also taught that those who are not converted *to* these, or *by* these, must go into endless punishment. And you teach the same things.

Now, in Matt. xv: 3, 6, Christ called *these doctrines*, which they were teaching, "traditions." And which, doubtless, they received from the Egyptians.

And, in Matt. xvi: 12, Jesus says "*beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees.*"

And it is evident all through the Gospels, that Jesus declares the Pharisees to be wrong in all things. Look at Christ's statements against them and their teachings.

He calls them in Matt. xv: 7, "hypocrites;" in Matt. xvi: 4, a "wicked and adulterous generation;" in Matt. xxiii: 13, "hypocrites;" in verse 16, "blind guides;" in verse 17, "fools and blind;" in verse 26, "blind Pharisees;" in verse 27, "like whited sepulchres;" in verse 33, "ye serpents, ye generation of vipers."

Do any of these things sound as if Christ sanctioned the Pharisees in any thing? Oh! what an infinite opposite to all approval of any thing in them. Hence, he warns his disciples a second time, in Matt. xvi: 6, "*beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.*"

THE MAINE CONVENTION.

On page 76, in Art. 4. appears the following from you, viz.,

"In the month of July 1835, the Universalist Convention of Maine passed a resolution that '*No man known to be addicted to habits of drunkenness, gambling, profane swearing, or who is an unbeliever in Christianity should be appointed to office in that society!*'" ("Trumpet," July 11th, 1835.)

This is a capital resolution. It is showing to all religious bodies just what their inside life should be. It is a very good resolution for some other denominations to adopt.

Now, if I mistake not, two-thirds of that State Convention was composed of lay delegates, to some of whom the *resolution* might have been applicable.

But you bring it forward and run a parallel with *your association composed wholly of ministers.*

Here you misrepresent and vilify the Maine State Convention, in making a vicious comparison of it with a *ministerial association.*

And then you nefariously ask "What would be said by Universalists should the ministerial convention of any Orthodox denomination find it necessary to pass such a resolution."

Now, to show you in a "*glass house*" on this *subject* and with an Orthodox denomination, I insert in full the following letter:

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK, Feb. 21, 1870.

REV. E. S. FOSTER,—*Dear Sir:*—Your favor of the 19th inst. is before me; I would reply that almost every Presbytery has at one time or another, passed resolutions on the subjects referred to in your letter, warning members against such allurements.

Then, those who fall into such practices, if church members, are liable to discipline by the church, and in case of no reformation, to expulsion.

Very Truly Yours,

S. W. STEBBINS, Depositary.

Again. In a historical discourse of the Orthodox Church at Springfield, Vt., preached by Rev. L. H. Cobb, May, 1869, occurs these words on page 18, viz., "The Church has held a generous discipline over its members; has faithfully disciplined those who have been guilty of drunkenness, profanity and other wrongs, immoralities and questionable practices."

The foregoing facts, I trust will bring the morals of Orthodoxy on these subjects, fully home to your understanding.

In comparison, how stands the *resolution* of the Maine State Convention?

Reader, can you now imagine a depth of infamy, that my opponent cannot fathom?

You challenge me to prove "*original sin*" as a belief of the Egyptians.

Proof. The Egyptians taught the transmigration of souls on the ground of previous and inherited sinfulness. And you put the elements of this system through the compound blow-pipe of Orthodoxy and you obtain the creed, "*original sin*." Hence, the creed is of *heathen origin*.

And on nearly the same theory, Dr. Beecher in his "Conflict of Ages," attributes the sins and woes of *this world*, to our sinfulness in a previous existence.

That the Egyptians taught miraculous conversion, it is only neccessary to know that among them was a scientific class of men, called *magicians*, who, they believed, could interpret dreams, foretell coming events, cast out demons, and thus by magic, change a person of *opposite* belief, to *their faith*.

The correctness of my reasoning is seen from Gen. xli : 8, "And it came to pass in the morning, that his spirit was troubled, and he sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dreams; but there was none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh." Exo. viii : 19, "Then the magicians said unto Pharaoh, This is the finger of God; and Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them: as the Lord had said." See Dan 2: And Jesus admits that the Pharisees cast out devils, that is, in *their belief*, changed

the disease, mind and character of the individual, for this he said in Matt. xii : 27 : "And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out ? therefore they shall be your judges.

Hence, in the foregoing we have the proof that the Egyptians believed in and taught miraculous conversion and the Pharisees believed and taught after the same manner.

A VIEW OF MISS L. A. PROUTY, ON THE UNIVERSALIST PLATFORM OF FAITH.

On page 9, and in 4th paragraph, Miss P. affirms that her belief would compel her to take the negative of the question, given on page 7, viz.: "Do the Scriptures teach the final triumph of sin and evil ?"

Now, to argue *this question* in the *negative*, is to support the strongest possible point of Universalism, after that of God and Christ. Thus to argue would be to deny almost the whole platform of Orthodoxy.

And here is Miss P. by her own assertions and claims : and yet, with all *her* marvelous knowledge, she does not know it.

Again. As the Bible declares that every person is from God, and as the Scriptures teach that the relationship of each person to Christ, is that of a sheep to a Shepherd, so it is evident that God deals with each person as possessing more or less of the character of said animal.

Hence, said the Prophet, Isa. lxi : 6, "All we like sheep have gone astray : " and Jesus speaks of the *wicked*, as wandering and lost sheep, and as not then of his fold. But he affirms, "Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd." John x : 6.

And this is the *same truth* which is taught in these words of Christ, viz., "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me." Thus, from the Prophets, and from Christ, we have it proved, that all men start from God as *sheep*, and all the wanderers are to be gathered to those "which went not astray," that there may be one fold and one shepherd ; and all drawn unto God by Christ.

Now, on page 83, and in last paragraph, *Miss P.* affirms "*Once a sheep, always a sheep*, and, though wandering, will seek the fold and be found at last by the owner." This, like the foregoing proof, is *emphatic Universalism*.

Finally she prays for Universalism. On page 77, and in last paragraph, she says "*I pray that all men may submit to the requirements of the Gospel.*"

This is radical Universalism! It seems that she is not yet, quite *totally depraved*, for she still prays for Universal Salvation.

Here, *Miss P.* has built her own scaffold, made her own rope, and hung herself—deliberately and willfully committed denominational suicide.

Reader! what think you of the picture?

WE COME NOW TO EXAMINE WHAT APPEARS TO BE SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT IN THE REPLY.

Here again, we find you reeling and stumbling about with the Greek "*aionion*." It is quite a *bone* for you. You grapple it in your jaws of arrogance and self-conceit, and tug blusteringly till you get it to a supposed hiding place of safety. Then some Orthodox scholar comes along and digs it out; after it again you go, with a growl.

But it is *bone still* for you, and without *any nourishment*. And with all your pursuit and employed help, you find no possible place for it in the skeleton of "*endless misery*."

You grasp it, hug it, and ride it, as a boy does his rocking horse. You whale away at it, but it goes not one inch *with* or *for* you. It will simply rock one way and the other within the limit of the *substantive*.

You bring forward Adam Clarke's opinion of "*aionion*," in Matt. xxv : 46, as if this settled its *meaning* upon a *rock*. But Dr. A. Clarke *vacillates* with the adjective from the same "*aion*" which is rendered "*world*" in Matt. xxiv : 3, and Heb. ix : 26, for he says *this* means "*age or dispensation*."

Again. The *adjective* from "*aion*" is in Eph. ii : 7, rendered "*ages*." Thus from all authority—especially from the Bible—the word "*aion*" and its derivatives are ambiguous words. That I am

right is evident, for we read in Matt. xxiv : 3, and in Heb ix : 26, and 1 Cor. x : 11, of *the end of "aionion,"* which is rendered *world and ages*.

You see now, that Inspiration here speaks *definitely of the end* of "*aionon*," and that it would be the height of folly to affirm that it meant endless.

Let the prayerful student, who is searching to know Christ, analyze this Greek word "*aion*;" and he will find it compounded of "*aei*," signifying *always*, and of "*ōn*," signifying being. Then the meaning of these two words (always being) in the Bible, must be found by common Scripture usage.

And the only places in the N. T. where this (*aei*) occurs, are as follows, viz., in Mark xv : 8, "As he had *ever (aei)* done unto them." Acts vii : 52, "Ye do *always (aei)* resist the Holy Ghost." 2 Cor. iv : 11, "For we which live are *always (aei)* delivered unto death for Jesus' sake." Surely, Paul did not mean that he and his companions were delivered unto death for *eternity* !

Again, 2 Cor. vi : 10, "As sorrowful, yet *always (aei)* rejoicing." Heb. iii : 10, "They do *always (aei)* err in their heart. 1 Peter iii : 16, "And be *always (aei)* ready to give an answer." 2 Peter i : 12, "To put you *always (aei)* in remembrance of these things." Tit. i : 12, "The Cretans are *always (aei)* liars."

These are all the places (we are told by the scholars) in which (*aei*) occurs as a separate word in the New Testament. And the unlearned as well as the learned can see that in neither case is there any allusion to eternity of duration. It simply denotes duration indefinite, which must be controlled by the noun to which it belongs.

Hence your bungling use of "*aionion*" from another's hand, passes by as a *pale shade*, without any relation to your fabled "*endless misery*."

And from the best authority it is shown clearly that "*aion*," and all its derivatives are literally *dead*, as to any evidence for your favorite *endless punishment*.

And your method with it forcibly presents a narrative which fully illustrates your dealings with the Bible and your ideal subject.

It is this, viz., "A certain dog which had made sad havoc in a shepherd's flock, was shot by the shepherd and left dead on the

field. A brawling and sarcastic religionist came along, and began beating the dead animal furiously. The shepherd called to him and desired to know *why* he was giving the dead dog such a thrashing. "Well," replied the conceited pedant, "it is to convince all dogs in the future, that there is endless punishment after death."

This figure illustrates exactly your work with "aionion." Not knowing that it is ambiguous, you prow around the fold of humanity with it to force a deadly bite. But the Greek and Scripture shepherd soon pierce the *word* with truth (as a minnie ball) from the substantive, and "aionion" stretches in death on the field of final redemption.

PUNISHMENT.

On page 68, and in 1st paragraph, you say "punishment has two significations." This is going beyond *Webster*. You define the punishment which is administered for *improvement* to be *chastisement*. The other definition, you say "is a full and final reward for crime," spoken of as *vengeance*, in Jude vii:

Your Dr. Webster defines *vengeance* to mean *punishment* which proceeds from the love of justice. In this case, *vengeance* is a just retribution, recompence or punishment. In this latter sense it is used in the Scriptures. Then he defines "*retribution*" to mean repayment, accommodated to the action."

Here then, your favorite Orthodox Webster tumbles your whole assertions and theories into irretrievable ruins.

Again. You say the term "*vengeance*" in Jude vii, "means the full and final reward of crime." This is *mere assertion* without the slightest proof. And Webster's *definition* condemns your assertion.

You also assert, that the final reward of the wicked is never called chastisement. This is but a childish assertion, without any proof.

Again. You assert, "that we do hear," (which is an inference from the Bible) of "*eternal vengeance*." Now, you cannot produce such a phrase as "*eternal vengeance*" in the Bible. Here you *belie the Bible again*, and then attempt to *deceive the reader*, on the awful subject of your *endless misery*.

Again. You assert, that "chastisement, being reformatory, is

not capable of endless duration ; but vengeance, being final, is capable of endless duration."

Now, just look up the three words, "*chastisement, vengeance and punishment*" from Webster, or any other scholar, and you will find their meaning one and the same. From Webster, and all scholars, the decision is correct, that when punishment becomes *endless, it ceases to be punishment and becomes revenge.*

Your reasoning about *revenge* and *vengeance* is as *flimsy* as your definitions of *punishment* and *chastisement*, and is *mere gossip* about *serious things.*

Lexicographers, among whom is Webster, define *vengeance* "as meaning *revenge*, when it is administered for other purposes than *justice.*" Now, justice signifies an equality between the act and the desert,—between cause and effect. And, as a *finite being* is incapable of an *infinite act*, so it is incapable of an infinite result, therefore, cannot suffer *endless misery.* And, as justice signifies an equal measure of *cause* and *effect* in all conceivable things, and its object in the whole economy of God is restoration and reconciliation, or harmony and peace, therefore endless misery would be *inconsistent, unjust and unallowable.*

If it be urged, that sin is *infinite*, because it is the transgression of an *infinite law*, and, consequently, deserves an *infinite* or endless punishment, it proves *too much*, and thus in *no way sustains* the doctrine of *endless torture.*

Look at this method of reasoning for a moment. Sin is *infinite* because it is the transgression of an *infinite law*, and deserves an endless consequent. By the same *rule* and *reasoning*, goodness is *infinite*, because it is the compliance with an *infinite law*, and, therefore, deserves an endless reward. And as *every person* has in some way *broken* and *kept* infinite laws, so by the *foregoing reasoning*, all must both suffer *endless punishment*, and enjoy *endless happiness.* Thus the reasoning, that sin is *infinite* because the transgression of an infinite law, and so deserves an endless punishment, becomes fallacy.

Again. If immortality, the resurrection life, "is all *by grace*, and *not of works*" (either of sin or righteousness) as inspiration affirms, then it follows as a *logical sequent*, that the supposed *endless misery* is by grace. And as grace is an *infinite solvent to all sin*, and is to abound much more than sin, it follows, as an inevita-

ble result, that *sin* and *suffering* will, in the full dispensation, in God's appointed time, be absorbed and succeeded by holiness and happiness.

Again. Let us examine the original Greek word "*diken*," which is in Jude VII: rendered, *vengeance*. Lexicographers define it to mean right, justice. And in the New Testament, as judicial punishment, vengeance, as in Jude VII. *All this definition is from an Orthodox Lexicon.*

Here, the original word in its original and Bible meaning, and from the Orthodox scholars too, signifies "right, justice judicial punishment," all of which gives no support to your *fabled subject*.

Examine the root of the same Greek word, which is "*dik*" and from it, in any sense, you cannot obtain the *slightest inference of duration*.

Now, comes your assertion on page 68, and 4th paragraph, viz.

"And the *vengeance of God is precisely what the Bible threatens as the portion of the wicked, hereafter.*"

Now, this is mere assertion without any foundation whatever. There is no such statement, nor any thing like it in the Scriptures.

Here again you make an addition to the Scriptures, to deceive the reader.

On page 68, and in 5th paragraph, occurs your masterly effort at reasoning, viz. "I reason thus, Vengeance is capable of endless duration. Punishment, in one form, is vengeance, therefore, punishment may have an endless duration. Therefore, *aionion* punishment is endless punishment, Q. E. D."—which was to be demonstrated.

Here your entire paragraph is founded on assertion, which is never an argument. First prove your premise, that punishment and vengeance (which are synonyms) have an endless signification, then you can make a logical conclusion of endless misery. But instead of doing this, you *presume* a conclusion which has no relation to the asserted premise. You have not proved that "*aionion*" punishment is capable of *endless duration*. And if we allow your assumed premise, you have entirely failed to prove "*aionion*" punishment to be "*endless misery*." Now, all there is to *this reasoning* is simply an *asserted premise* and an *asserted conclusion*. It proves

nothing, the common school-boy pronounces it nonsense—mere twaddle. And yet, the *self-conceited author* thinks it the *might of Infinity*, the rule of *endless misery*.

Look at it! By the same rule (with the change of subject word) you can prove any thing. We will try it.

"I reason thus. Annihilation is capable of endless duration. Punishment, in one form, is annihilation, therefore annihilation may have an endless duration. Therefore *aionion* destruction is endless punishment, which was to be demonstrated." But look once more at the twaddling measure.

"I reason thus. Drunkenness is capable of endless duration. Rum-drinking in one form, is drunkenness, therefore, drunkenness may have an endless duration. Therefore *aionion* drunkenness is endless drunkenness, which was to be demonstrated."

Now, if your measure of reasoning (which the common school-boy pronounces nonsense) is not *verbiage* then there is no such thing as *vagary* in *human communication*. I have only noticed this sophism, because a *very few* think it the climax of argument.

That I am right thus far is evident from the English root of the word *vengeance* which is "*venge*" defined by all Lexicons as meaning "*to punish*." And your method of reasoning is, by all logicians, pronounced *fallacy* and *sophistry*. And inspiration emphatically *declares against you*, for it uses this very term "*vengeance*," as a means of salvation to Israel. Hence in Isa. xxxv: 4, are these words. "Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be strong, fear not! behold your God will come with a *vengeance*, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you." Here "*vengeance*" is a means of *grace*, and for *salvation*. How evident it is at every step, that you have not studied this subject.

Again. The word *punishment* in all its elements sustains me in all my argument, and is a proof of final redemption. The origin of the term *punishment*, is the Greek word "*kolasin*," which in the time of Christ (*all the scholars say*) meant "*pruning* or *trimming*," "as the pruning or trimming of trees."

Look at *this meaning*. We prune and trim trees and plants to remove the dead, useless parts and to invigorate, to *recuperate* and *urge into a new life*, and to produce a more perfect fruit. And this is the meaning of the word *punishment* as it comes to us in the

Bible. It is from God, to *prune* and *trim* from us all dead and unworthy material, and to recuperate and urge us into a new life. Remember, we never prune and trim a plant or tree in order to kill it, or to cause it to produce a poorer fruit; but the opposite. Just so is it with punishment. Its very elements imply limitation to all its processes.

Hence, from *kolasin*, signifying *pruning, trimming*, the deductive meaning to man and character is this, viz., *correction, discipline or reformation*.

Now, if we take the text in Matt. xxv: 46, and put in the regular definitions of "*aionion*" and "*kolasin*" (the words rendered everlasting punishment) as given by all scholars, it will become very plain and read thus: "These shall go away into an age-lasting correction, discipline and reformation; but the righteous into an age-lasting life;" *to the Church Militant*.

It is evident from Josephus and all profane history that the Jews, as a nation, especially the Pharisees, who were guilty of "all manner of sin and blasphemy," have been from the coming of Christ in his Kingdom to this day in an age-lasting correction, discipline and reformation. On the other hand, the *Righteous* of Christ's day have had an *age-lasting* life in the Church Militant.

A SYNOPSIS OF THE WHOLE SUBJECT.

By Webster, punishment is defined to be "pain or suffering inflicted for crime." Chastisement is defined to be "punishment, pain inflicted for correction." *Vengeance* is defined to be "pain inflicted for an injury or offence—punishment."

The Greek "*kolasin*," rendered *punishment*, is defined to be "pruning and trimming as in the case of trees."

The Greek "*paideias*" rendered *chastisement*, is defined to be "*correction*."

The Greek "*diken*," rendered *vengeance*, is defined to mean "right, justice, and in the New Testament, judicial punishment."

From the foregoing it is evident that *punishment, chastisement* and *vengeance*, may be truly resolved into this, viz., a *just correction, discipline and reformation from sin*.

Thus much on *punishment*, the evidence of which forces me to be a *Universalist*, and how completely and utterly does it sweep away every vestige of support from your ideal *endless misery*.

WE WILL NOW EXAMINE THE ENDLESS LIFE AS
APPLIED TO CHRIST.

On page 70, and in bottom paragraph, is the quotation from me, as given on page 59 of the Discussion, viz., "if Matt. xxv : 46, read 'apeleusontai outsi eis kolasin akataluton, oi de dikaioi eis zoēn akataluton,' which, translated is 'these shall go away into endless punishment, but the righteous into endless life,' then I would grant that the Bible taught *your doctrine*."

On this you come forward and, as usual, on *crutches* attempt to pick up "*akataluton*," the only word in the Greek which is rendered endless.

You say, (in opposition to all scholars and in opposition to the *life of Christ*.) that the word does not mean *endless*, but that it means "indissoluble, indestructible.

Here, you deny one *definition*, and then assert another which is the only *parallel definition* within the language. It is not within your power to tell the difference between the meaning of the word *endless* and the word *indestructible*.

With this whole matter connected with this word, "*akataluton*," just as with *aion*, you appear like a boy in a school-house with closed blinds and doors, and without company. And so you go smashing around amid dust, darkness and cobwebs, in pursuit of "*akataluton*," that you may wrench it from an *endless significance* connected with the life of Christ.

You make an *unguarded* and *irreverent assertion* about the priesthood, mentioned in the 16th and 17th verses of Heb. 7; which *distinctly shows that you have not studied the subject*.

Your jumbled mess about the Latin and Greek endings of *eternam* and *aionion*, and the connection you make of them with Heb. vii: 16, together with the assertion that "*aionion* is a stronger term than *akataluton*" shows at once, to the *careful reader*, that you had the *Elephant* on your hands in that one word "*akataluton*."

Again. You represent that your argument has forced me to own that "*aionion*" meant endless when joined with anything that had *endless signification*. Now this misrepresents and belies both

yourself and me in regard to this statement; for *I gave that definition* when dealing with the word freely and fully, not by any suggestion of yours nor from any thing you had received from another. And *you* was the one who came to it, and admitted it.

Again. On p. 71, and in 5th paragraph, will be seen the frivolousness with which you deal with sacred things. And yet how could we expect otherwise from a person who will misrepresent and falsify anything, even the Saviour, to accomplish a base end in a religious discussion? Now in that 5th paragraph, the word "*aiona*" which occurs in Heb. vii : 17, has an *endless signification* answering to the rule which I have given you several times. Its meaning of *endless* is *derived wholly* from the "*akataluton*" life of Christ, mentioned in Heb. vii : 16. And yet, in what the logicians pronounce *fallacy* and *sophistry*, you assume that the ambiguous word "*aiona*" is a superior and stronger word than "*akataluton*."

But "*akataluton*" stands in its magnificent *infinity*, before your anomalous misrepresentations, comments and definitions, like a Universe before the pratings of besotted conceit. And though this word, "*akaluton*," occurs but *once* in the New Testament, yet its meaning is the *basis* of the *resurrection* life, and *all we know of the world immortal*, but we never find it connected with sin, hell, punishment, death or evil.

Verily, as we follow you, how evident it is that you came upon the discussion of the awful question of *endless misery*, not prayerfully and candidly, (as you promised,) but bragging from house to house, about "*the fun you would get out of it.*" What a wonderful likeness to the *brawling vagrant* boy, who *went to sea* on a *raft* which he built out of *old rotten plank*.

THE RESURRECTION STATE.

On page 51, and in the bottom paragraph, which extends on to page 52, the following *proof*, in confirmation of the correctness of my argument, appears in these words, viz.:

"In all our Saviour's descriptions of the resurrection state, we have no description of two classes, no representation of *two conditions*, though he was preaching directly to the boldest of infidels, and to those who afterwards murdered him, mentioned in Luke

xx: 38. And he makes no affirmation that the resurrection life is to be according to any *professions* or *works* in *this world*.

And in all of them, (where "*anastasis ton nekron*" occurs,) there is no intimation that there is *there*, any *separation*, or that in *that world*, is another *ordeal* for man to pass. *Strange conditions* if the Orthodox *terms* of salvation, the general judgment, and endless punishment are true."

Now, your *favorite*, and almost *only method* in *your* (so called) *discussions*, is fully seen in the following paragraph, which on page 69, you devote to the foregoing *proof*.

"You," Mr. Foster, "rely for 'proof of the salvation of the righteous upon the phrase 'resurrection of the dead.'" Regarding this phrase you affirm that, "*in all our Saviour's and in all Paul's description of the resurrection state, we have no description of two classes; no representation of two conditions; and no affirmation that that resurrection will be according to any profession or works in this world*. You see, here is a wilful *misrepresentation* of my whole proposition on this point and then a falsification of the *conclusion*.

Here, you represent, *is the sum and substance* of my argument, for the *resurrection life of redemption*. And yet you have *left out all that made it an argument*, and left it simply *as an assertion*. You left out *the positive evidence given from Christ*; you left out *the great criterion* of the life beyond the grave; and which to all scholars, is the *reliable evidence* of the *resurrection of the dead*.

Remember, (and examine it too) I stated in that argument, that in *all of the places* where "*anastasis ton nekron*," occurred, (and which words constitute much proof of the life immortal,) there is no reference to a separation in the incorruptible state, or that in that world, is another *ordeal*, for man to pass."

And *this is all* that constituted it an *argument*, and *this* you *left out* making it, like your argument, *mere assertion*. Then you bring up to answer it, the text in John v: 28, 29, "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." And *these verses* you assume as teaching things about the *world* and *life*, beyond the grave.

And yet, in these verses the reliable words viz., "*anastasis ton nekron*," for the life immortal, do not occur.

It is evident too, that these verses in John v : 28, 29, have *no reference* to the *conditions* of the *world immortal*, for the resurrection mentioned in these verses, is according to *good and evil works*; while the *Scriptures declare* that "the *life immortal*—the life in the world beyond the grave—is *not of works* lest any man should boast."

Again. It is evident from the *context* that John v : 28, 29, has no reference to anything in the future. Hence, in 25th verse, it says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *the hour is coming and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice, &c."

Thus it is evident from all considerations, that Jno. v : 28, 29, relates wholly to the *resurrection*, at the coming of Christ in his kingdom, about A. D. 70. Then, those in the graves of spiritual death awoke—came forth to the damnation of guilt, blindness, and infidelity. And "they that had done good"—had worked the blessed life in Christ—came forth to understand their situation—rose to a full belief in God, and Christ, and the Gospel.

That I am, correct in the interpretation of Jno. v : 28, 29, is evident from the testimony of *four Orthodox Commentators* (Drs. Lightfoot, Doddridge, Whitby, and Bishop Cappe,) all of whom explain John v : 28, 29, as I have done.

Thus much upon your superlative misrepresentation of my argument on the resurrection, and the subject in Jno. v : 28, 29.

As we search you, it seems a thing impossible for you to take up an *argument* of *mine* with honesty, and handle it with candor and prayer.

THE SECOND DEATH.

On page 69, and in 6th paragraph, you bring forward Rev. xx : 6, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first resurrection*, on *uch the second death hath no power*."

This text, you *assume* is descriptive of events in the world immortal; and it is *mere assumption* without *any proof*; and the scholars of all denominations uniformly treat the same text and subject as incapable of any such proof.

You next *infer* that "*the second death*" means *endless misery*, which is but a chimera of yours.

Now, the bringing forward of Rev. xx: 6, and the use you make of it, shows conclusively, that you have not studied the *text* nor *context*, neither have you consulted biblical scholars on the subject.

Examine the text. It speaks of "the *first resurrection*;" which is without significance in the future state, for the scriptures *never speak* of two resurrections, (*ton nekron*) of the dead.

It is plain and clear to the Bible student, that the text is without evidence for application to matters in the world immortal.

If there is a *first* resurrection, which has authority, so there must be a second; and if there is a second death which has authority, so there must be a first.

What, therefore, is the second resurrection, and what is the first death? You see it will not answer the requirement of *responsibility to God and humanity*, on the awful question of *endless misery*, to make *inferences* and *suppositions* about *scripture*, and palm them off upon society as *revealed truth*.

Principle, truth and justice are demanded at each of our hearts from God, in all matters and especially on the Scripture and our destiny.

Now, this phrase "*second death*," occurs only in the book of Revelations, and in this it occurs four times, viz., ii: 11, and xx: 6, 14, and xxi: 8.

And before it can be claimed as a *doctrine of Christianity*, it must be shown that Christ and other apostles taught it. But this cannot be shown, consequently it must belong to other circumstances than those of immortality and the soul's final destiny. And it must have a meaning; yes, a meaning level to the understanding of some to whom John spake.

John, while at Patmos, addressed this letter to the Churches, the principle subject of which is the Jews. And the best scholars, (among whom is Prof. Moses Stewart,) have decided that it was written *in* or before A. D. 69, which was just previous to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jews, as a nation.

Some good scholars have explained the *first death* to mean the death of the *Jewish nation in the Babylonish captivity*; and the return from it, as the *first resurrection*. And the *second death*, to mean the *last destruction*, which occurred about A. D. 70. This explanation has much evidence to support it, from both sacred and profane history.

Again. What is the *second death*? The Scriptures answer, Rev. xx: 14, "And death and hell" (after all were delivered from them) "were cast into the lake of fire. *This is the second death.*" And again in Rev. xxi: 8, "But the fearful and unbelieving &c. . . . shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, *which is the second death.*"

All the parts of *these figures are material* and belong to earth, and literally hold the whole to an earthly solution.

And from *these definitions*, we feel confident, that to be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone was the *second death*. The revelator, at the time he mentioned the "*second death*," had been speaking of the rebellious and persecuting Jews, "the synagogue of Satan."

That the Jews as a nation were cast into the lake of fire, when their city was destroyed the *second time*, will be evident to every one who will read Ezek. xxi: 18, 19, 20, 21—"Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross: all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace: they are even the dross of silver. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Because ye all become dross, behold therefore I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it, so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you, and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof." And Isa. xxxi: 9, "The Lord's fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem."

The Revelator gives it in these words, Rev. xx: 9, "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

Here the camp of the saints and the beloved city can mean no other than the city of Jerusalem. And the *lightning* from heaven, which is fire with a sulphurous smell, made the prophecy perfect, as a lake of *fire and brimstone*.

Then the Jews suffered the *second death*—an utter, total death, the entire overthrow and extinction of their nation.

"He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death," or "he that hath part in the first resurrection, *on such the second death*

hath no power." That is, he that is faithful through all tribulations shall not be involved in the general calamity which is about to fall on the Jews, and on the enemies of Christ.

And all of this account is in perfect keeping with our Saviour's description of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jews, given in Matt. xxiii : xxiv : and xxv.

And it is a fact sustained by profane history, that those, who embraced Christ in a blessed life between the years of A. D. 30, and 69, *did escape* at the destruction of Jerusalem, and on them the *second death of the nation had no power.*

Now, that my conclusions are correct, and that the subject of the *second death* (mentioned in Revelation) affords no proof for *endless misery*, is evident from four eminent Orthodox scholars and commentators (viz. Welstein, Lightfoot, Rosenmuller and Dr. Hammond), who by no means apply Rev. xx : 6 to the *world to come*. See their works.

There is a very *large amount* of more testimony, from the Scriptures, and from the scholars, in confirmation of my explanation, which there is not room here to introduce. Thus much on the "*second death*," which wholly absorbs all your assumptions, inferences and suppositions on the subject.

On page 69, and in bottom paragraph, you say, "If Paul taught that all mankind would be saved, what mean his solemn warnings against apostacy, in Heb. x : 26 to 31?"

These mean just what Christ threatened upon the murderous Jews, as recorded in Matt. xxiii : xxiv : xxv : all of which came upon that generation, and before some to whom he spoke suffered death.

Again. You ask in the same paragraph, "What means his awful imprecation in 1 Cor. xvi : 22, where it says, If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha?"

Prof. Crosby, one of the ablest Greek scholars, and one of the most devoted of christians, says it means this, viz. "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha (*a curse*; the Lord will come; i. e. let him be accursed, as he assuredly will be at the coming of the Lord.)"

See Adam Clarke on the text. In it neither he nor any other commentator allows any proof of *endless misery*.

On page 70, and in 1st paragraph, with your accustomed misrepresentation and inference, you present the text in Luke xx: 35, "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage."

Here, from all the scholars of nearly all denominations you do not gain any proof of your inference. Adam Clarke considers the text of so little importance as not to notice it. The expression is fully understood, when we remember that Jesus was speaking to the Sadducees, who did not account mankind as worthy of a resurrection.

In the same paragraph, you bring forward Jude 7: as proving *endless misery*. And you manage this text just as you have all the rest: you assume that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah are in *endless misery* and then quote these words from Jude 7: viz. They were "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." The whole verse simply "sets them forth for an example as suffering the vengeance (or punishment) of eternal (*aionion*, or age-lasting) fire" or purification. Oh! how like chaff in the wind do your assumptions move off, the moment we apply scripture to them.

On page 71, and in 6th paragraph, you affirm that "I regard *repentance* as an *event*, coming to man as inevitably as the hour of his death." This is very incorrect. We do *not* regard it as an *event*, but a *process*, to which the sinner is going just as the prodigal went into *perishing with hunger*.

On page 47, I brought forward (in the 3d paragraph), to prove the universality and certainty of *repentance*, several texts, among which is this, viz. Isa. xlv: 23, 24, "I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."

To which you reply on page 72, and in first paragraph, thus: "The text you quote from Isa. xlv: 23, 24, actually reads; 'Surely shall *one* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and

strength: *even* to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. I wonder if Dr. Whately says anything about the fallacy of quotations?"

This (so-called) argument is the climax of absurdity and bombast. Look at it! You accuse me of misrepresenting and garbling the Scriptures when the *charge* lies at your own door. The word *one* which you represent as *inspiration* and that I left it out for deception, is a *supplied* word by the Translator, and is without authority. And with it in the 24th verse, Orthodoxy can dodge the truth of ultimate redemption.

But what an infinite jargon does it make, with the words (in the 23d verse) of inspiration, viz. "Unto me every knee shall bow and every tongue shall swear."

Here is the plural adjective "*every*," used *twice* by Inspiration, to mean *all persons* and in one continuous sentence with the 24th verse; and to put in the word *one* makes the text grammatical nonsense. And to sustain you in this *dishonesty*, you quote Dr. Whately, in a burlesque manner, again, viz. "I wonder if Dr. Whately says anything about fallacy of quotations."

Hence, here you first misrepresent me and the Scriptures, then you *falsify* both, and then you strain hard to put the heinous load on to me; and last of all, you try to twist Dr. Whately to *affirm* to your abandoned effort.

On page 72, and in 3d paragraph, you affirm that "the *promise* mentioned in Ps. xxii: 27, is spoken of kindreds and nations collectively, not of individuals."

But the promise which God confirmed by an oath with himself, mentioned in Gen. xii: 3, says "all families of the earth shall be blessed." And in Gen. xxii: 13, "all the nations shall be blessed."

And Peter in Acts iii: 26, quotes the promise, "all the kindreds of the earth." Now, all nations, all families, and all kindreds of the earth, must mean *all mankind*; and the blessing is salvation from sin. Read, Acts iii: 25, 26.

Truly, this is an infinite argument for Universalism and by the oath of God.

On page 72, and in 5th paragraph, you apply Isa. xlv: 23, to a judgment day, and then you infer it to be in the *resurrection state*, which fact is not mentioned in the Scriptures.

Then you represent that Christ will tyrannize over the wicked and tread them down, and treat them as would a savage despot, or a barbarous chief. Surely, such circumstances will most effectually constitute *hell*, and our Saviour as chief in it.

But how different does Christ teach from all this—*yes*, with what an *infinite difference*. He teaches through all his Gospel, that man; all men, are *conquered, subdued, and subject* unto him, when all become his friends, in the same degree that he is the friend of *all men*.

If the Scriptures are reliable, *all men* are to come under the *same subjection* to Christ that Christ is under to God, and in which Christ comes at last to God. Hence says Paul 1st Cor. 15: 28, "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Here the same word rendered *subdued* in the case of *all things* (meaning all men), is the same word in the original Greek "*upotage*" which is rendered *subject* in the case of Christ unto God.

Oh! how beautiful, and grand, and infinite is such a victory. This explanation harmonizes the whole Scriptures, and fully explains the text, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, *will draw* all men unto me."

At the bottom of page 72, you bring forward Luke XIII: 3, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish," and infer that this proves *endless misery*, and that repentance will clear a person from it. Nothing can be further from the truth, than such inferences; for if the text proves anything in the future life, from sin unrepented of in this world, it proves *annihilation*, which you fully condemn.

Again. Read the context, and the Scripture meaning of these words—"except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish"—will be seen to be this, viz. unless you Jews—you wicked generation of vipers—repent, ye shall perish in like manner to the *eighteen* on whom the tower of Siloam fell. That is, suddenly and irretrievably. And as they did not repent, many were destroyed suddenly and in like manner, under the falling walls and towers of their city.

All of your commentators (as far as I can learn) give the same explanation. Thus the Bible and the scholars sweep away all your positions.

You say, in connection with the same subject (repentance), that "I represent that obedience will receive precisely the same treatment as disobedience."

This statement is as far from truth as east is from west, for obedience and disobedience are exact opposites. Obedience has nothing to repent of, while disobedience must repent of all its sins. Obedience is reconciliation and peace with God. Disobedience is rebellion and misery, in the transgressor. Virtue is happiness and vice is misery at all times and in all places. Surely there is a vast difference between obedience and disobedience.

On page 73, and in the 4th and 5th paragraphs, you undertake to show that the Bible contradicts itself by making some references and then asserting, that "these declarations look as if repentance could clear a person from the result of sin."

Yes, they may *look* like it through the *spectacles* of misrepresentation. But the Scriptures are positive and emphatic on the subject. Examine Prov. xi: 21, "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not go unpunished." 1 Cor. iii: 8, "And every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor." Col. iii: 25, "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons."

These are positive declarations of Inspiration, and with no exceptions, and no offers granted for escape.

Reader, which will you accept, the Bible teachings, or Miss Prouty's assertions?

On page 73, and in 6th paragraph, you ask—after looking at these positive declarations about the consequences of *sin* without any offers of escape—"Pray tell me, then, from what are men saved?"

What a question, from one who regards what she does not know as foolishness! What a question too, with the Bible before you!

But your question:—"Pray tell me, then, from what are men saved?"

The Bible answers, in terms which cover the whole ground of lost man. First, it answers, "from sin" Matt. 1: 21. Second, it answers, "from darkness," John xii: 46, and Col. 1: 13. Third, it answers, "from unbelief," Romans xi: 32. Fourth, it answers, "from error," James v: 20.

These are the four *special salvations* of which the Bible speaks. And it is very remarkable that the Bible in no place speaks of, nor infers a salvation from *hell*, or endless punishment.

Suppose salvation to signify the deliverance of the soul from "*endless misery*," and suppose the "Orthodox conditions" to be the *offered terms* (which are not allowed in the Bible) of that salvation; then answer, with a seriousness which the dying soul demands, this question, viz. is *salvation* by the Gospel, *offered* to all in this life.

Query, If the *Orthodox terms of salvation* are *Bible conditions*, how does it happen that the Bible never speaks of salvation from a future hell? Again. If *endless misery* be a doctrine of the Bible, why does it not speak of a salvation from *endless punishment*?

EXAMINE ANOTHER UNTRUTH.

On page 73, and in bottom paragraph, you say, that "Universalism presents a Redeemer, who frees us from nothing; a Saviour whose salvation relieves from nothing; and talks of the mercy of God who forgives nothing."

As I pursue you, I am almost convinced, that it is *impossible* for you to represent, honestly, a single point of a person's faith who is opposed to your belief.

Universalism presents a Saviour who *saves* from *sin* and frees from *darkness*, who delivers from *unbelief*, and redeems from *error*. It presents a God who is an Infinite Father, without variability or shadow of turning, and who forgives sin, transgression and iniquity. And all these things are just as the Bible teaches.

But remember, the Scriptures in no place speak of forgiving *punishment*, or any of the *consequences* of sin.

The *mercy* of God is not a salvation from the *consequences* of sin, but the manifestation of infinite love, in a knowledge through Christ, which redeems man—all men—from sin, darkness, unbelief and error. The Gospel is God's gift to the human race; Christ's blood is the seal of infinite Love, which makes the Gospel a legal inheritance to all men. By a metonymy of speech, Christ's blood represents the Gospel, the knowledge of which constitutes the remission or removal of sins, as mentioned in Matt. xxvi: 28. But it is never represented as a remission of endless misery; for all Scripture fully presents the infinite opposite. Hence we read in 1 Jno. 2: 2, "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." What a universality! This is *infinite* Universalism!

That first Orthodox sermon, preached by the Serpent to Eve in the Garden, viz. "Ye shall not surely die," (if you will accept the terms of my religion,) gives you some trouble, for with all your skill, shrewdness and falsification, it remains Orthodoxy still, and Satan stands as your right-hand man. Ah! what can you do? What would become of your *faith* without that shadowy, mythical personage, called—Satan?

The text in Prov. xi: 31, says, "The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and sinner."

You affirm, "that this is not apparent in this world, that the wicked still prosper in this world and the righteous are still afflicted." But the text in Prov. xi: 31, is truth—yes, *inspired* truth your affirmation to the contrary notwithstanding.

Universalism preaches, just as God did to Eve, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"—surely shall suffer the consequences of sin. But "*repent*," remember and turn, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"—the kingdom of light and truth. "Love God because he first loved us," for "he that loveth God is born of God and knoweth God, for God is love."

Universalism preaches as inspiration does, that all will repent, "all will remember and turn unto the Lord," and "every tongue shall confess Jesus Lord to the glory of God the Father," and every knee shall bow in the same subjection to Christ that Christ renders at last unto the Father.

You affirm, that we believe and preach, that the profane man, dying with horrid oaths upon his tongue, and that the murderers referred to, have gone straight to Heaven, and repentance will make no difference with them.

Now, there is far more truth in the above statement for Orthodoxy than there is in it for Universalism. Those murderers believed they were going direct from the scaffold to Heaven, and Orthodox ministers helped them into the belief, and stood by them when they made the fatal plunge. But Universalists believe and preach that those persons and all murderers will be fully punished—will repent, and be taught of God through Christ, and through him be saved from sin, before they enter on the joys of Heaven.

On page 77, you say that your argument on 1 Tim. 11: 1 to 4. and which occurs on the 35th page, "has not been refuted." I passed it as needing no examination—it was a refutation in itself. What you vainly thought was argument, was so inapplicable, and so perfectly left the great truths of *final redemption* glowing more brightly, that I concluded to be germane with your comments and so advanced nothing. About 1 Tim. 11: 1 to 4, you make a few assertions, and one reference to Eph. 1: and your admissions in connection with the same about the *fullness* of the gospel provisions of salvation, perfectly annihilate your whole labor on this text.

Again. The Greek words, "thelei sothenai" in connection with Matt. xv: 28, and xxiii: 37, and Luke viii: 20—which you bring forward to prove the record in 1 Tim. 11: 1 to 4, *false*—appear like hot bricks in your hand which cannot be fitted.

But here is the text—look at it! 1 Tim. 11: 1 to 7, "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. Whereunto I am ordained a preacher and an apostle."

What a *wholeness*, what a *fullness*, what an *infinity*, hangs all around these words! How like jewels do they appear in the crown of the Infinite. There is such a vastness of redemption under the power of infinity in them, that it is but weakness to try to explain a more perfect system of Universalism.

And yet, you have the audacity to say (and it is the only way you can meet the words in your belief) that "there is no authority for interpreting them as expressing God's absolute determination."

All can see, that it requires an enormous stretch of hardihood, without any sense of *conscientiousness*, to make such an assertion, against these words of Holy Writ, which are so plain, and so vast in their significance.

The text—1 Tim. ii: 1 to 7—stands as an eternal monument against you.

Heb. ix: 27, 28, has no bearing on the resurrection-life. Paul brought forward a comparison (in that passage) between the yearly death of the high priests and the *one* sacrifice of Christ for all. Read the entire chapter and your commentators, and you will see that I am right.

ALL RIGHTEOUS PERSONS PRAY FOR UNIVERSALISM.

In 1 Tim. ii: 1 to 8 is the inspired exhortation, to pray for all men. Then in the 8th verse, it is stated as a "*will*" that we pray for the same. How to state a plainer statute of the Infinite, I cannot conceive. And it is evident, Paul knew as much in its truth, as you do in assertion.

Now, to be commanded to *pray* for the salvation of *all men*, and to pray in *faith*, without *wrath* or *doubting*, and yet, believe in *endless misery*, is a deplorable condition. And in hobbling around it, you make one admission, which condemns all you have otherwise said on the subject. The admission is this, viz. "I pray that all men may submit to the requirements of the Gospel."

This is radical Universalism. It is just what all good persons of all denominations, in all lands are praying for. You pray for it, and then doubt it; *yes*, doubt it all the time you are praying for it; and then preach and argue, "that it is all *bosh*—*all a lie*." This is simply quoting your own words, used in your street walks."

How different is our case. We *pray* for the salvation of *all men*; we *believe* the salvation of all men, as Jesus gave himself a ransom for *all*, to be testified in due time; and we *preach* the salvation of all men, and are ready to live and die for it.

How awful to be *obliged* from God's holy word to *pray* for the salvation of *all men*, then doubt it, and deny it, and argue against it; and then misrepresent and falsify yourself, your neighbor, the Epistles, Apostles and the Saviour, in order to support *endless misery*!

What can be more *horrible*, than a system of religion, which puts you into such a situation? How *harrowing* must be the thought, that this system cannot be preached at the funeral of any one, unless it be over the body of its public professor!

Humanity, and all we know of God, and Christ, and angels, revolts at the presentation of such a religion, as *comfort* to the mourner and bereaved. It is so derogatory to every sense of justice and christian sympathy, that Orthodox ministers *dare* not preach it at the funeral of a person who has not given evidence of its belief.

It is truly a soul-debasing subject, for which you *dare* not pray, though you resort to any means but truth, honesty and devotion, to argue it.

Here, let the reader analyze your first and last statements on the subject of prayer. First. You say, "I pray that all men may submit to the requirements of the Gospel."

Second. "Therefore I do not pray for Universalism to be true."

These two statements show the *consistency* of your argument on the divine exhortation and will, that every person *pray* for the salvation of all men.

Now as "God hears the prayers of the righteous," Prov. xv : 29, and "the desire of the righteous shall be granted," Prov. x : 24, is the proof not positive and infinite for the salvation of all men? Again. As all good and righteous persons *pray* for the salvation of *all men*, and as God hears their prayer, and grants their *desire*, is it possible for *final redemption to fail*? Does *Universalism thus rest on sand*?

If you engage in the act of prayer for the salvation of *all men*, and have no faith in the salvation of *all men*, is it not sin?

1 John v : 16, "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death : I do not say that he shall pray for it," you bring up, as proof of *endless misery*. And among all your scholars and commentators, but one supports your inference. What more thorough refutation do you want of this text ?

Matt. xvi : 12, Christ said "beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees."

The Pharisees' special doctrines were original sin, a personal devil, and endless punishment. The Sadducees' special doctrine was a bold denial of a future existence.

Hence our Saviour's admonition about both of them, for they taught the foregoing doctrines.

THE SILENCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, ON THE LIFE BEYOND THE GRAVE.

The question asked in Job xiv : 14, "If a man die, shall he live again?" you affirm, was answered in the next verse. This is really conceited assumption and assertion, without any proof of the fact. And it would be the height of folly, for a common individual to ask such a momentous question, and then immediately apply such an answer.

Hence, it is an enormous absurdity, to make the gifted Job, by inspiration affirm such a statement as the solution of mortality. The best scholars allow no such inference. And the New Testament speaks emphatically against it.

The words of Job, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come,"—can mean no more than simply waiting patiently and prayerfully till he could see his misfortunes and sorrows as from a Father's hand; till the change came of reconciliation to the terrible ordeal in which he was placed. And in the context Job explains the *change* to mean just this:—for, in Job xix : 26, he says, "Yet in my flesh shall I see God." And he fully represents his reconciliation to be the *sight* of God. And in the reconciliation he says, (Job xlii : 5,) "but now mine eye seeth thee."

On the text in Matt. xxii: 32, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," I remark that a part of Matt. xxii: 32, Jesus quotes from the Old Testament Scriptures, asking the Sadducees (who were infidel Jews) if they have not read what was spoken unto them by God saying, (verse 32), "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?"

This is the end of the quotation from the Old Testament, and in the Old Testament, where these words occur, there is not an *inference* even of a life beyond the grave. Jesus brings them forward four hundred years after the Old Testament, and from them, by his own argument added to them, in the words "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," he proves an immortal life.

This is all that can be made out of your strongest texts, and the Old Testament remains silent on the future world. Christ did not teach immortality out of the words of the Old Testament—he simply took the words about Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and *made an argument* to prove immortality; he made a revelation unto them—he brought the life immortal to light. It was not known till Jesus came.

These *texts* are the strongest of *all* you have given. All the others go down under the same testimony. And 2 Tim. i: 9 to 11, remains in the full force of infinity against you.

The faith in which the old prophets died was the faith in a coming messiah, who should deliver Israel and give them Canaan for an everlasting possession. The phrase "evidence of things not seen," (Heb. xi: 1,) is not used by Paul in connection with the Prophets. The *pilgrim* was but the traveler to the ideal *land of Canaan*, the Heavenly country.

Thus, *all* you present. fails to prove a *resurrection life* from the Old Testament.

And the words, "immortal, immortality, and resurrection," do not occur in the Old Testament. Hence, there is no evidence in it, which I can discover, on which to base such a doctrine.

THE PARABLE OF THE SHEEP AND GOATS.

This parable occurs in Matt. xxv : 32, 33. According to Orthodoxy, this parable teaches that all men are *goats* when first created; and conversion to Orthodoxy makes them *sheep*. This is in keeping with the creed of original sin, and total depravity.

But our Saviour took little children in his arms and said "of *such* is the kingdom of heaven."

According to Orthodoxy, they must have been goats, for they had not been converted, nor met with any change of heart. And if little children are *goats* (according to Orthodoxy) and endless misery is true, then *infant damnation* is certain. And this doctrine, Orthodoxy has *preached* openly and boldly for years.

Again. Orthodoxy teaches that a person is either a *goat* or a *sheep*—either *wicked* or *righteous*. But, the parable, I think teaches that in *every person* there is more or less of the character of each of these animals. It teaches to me clearly, that the goat character—the wicked part of each individual—is to be cast out, is to go into "*aionion*" or age-lasting punishment, correction or reformation.

This explanation harmonizes the whole with the parable of the *lost sheep*, which represents that Christ will search till he finds the *lost soul* and then he returns it.

YOU CHARGE OUR SAVIOUR WITH UNTRUTH.

On page 34, and in 4th paragraph, you affirm "that the New Testament has employed every form of expression of which language is capable, to threaten "*endless punishment*. And yet, Christ in no place, even to the vilest of sinners, has threatened any person with ("akataluton") *endless punishment*.

And in all the charges, brought by the unbelieving Jews against Christ, they never accused him of threatening them with *endless misery*. These Jews, of all others, were the most guilty of persons, even to the sin against the Holy Ghost. But Christ never threatened them with endless death, misery, or hell.

Yet, you say "every form of expression of which language is capable is used to express it."

Reader! Which think you tells the truth—Miss P. or the Bible?

Again. Jesus says in Matt. xvi: 27, 28, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Matt. xxiii: 36, "all these things" (referring to the terrible judgments) shall come upon this generation." Matt. xxiv: 34, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled."

And yet, on page 16, and in Art. 3, you assert "that Christ himself expressly declared that he would not come at the destruction of Jerusalem. (See Matt. xxiii: 23 to 27.) This is literally charging the Great Redeemer with untruth.

MISS PROUTY'S LIST OF FOOLS.

On page 82, and in 4th paragraph, she says "The doctrine of *endless punishment* is so plainly revealed 'that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein'"

Here is a short list of a very few, who were among the brightest, best, and most learned which this world has produced, but who found no evidence, in or out of the Bible, for "*endless misery*."

Dr. Hey, Rev. Jeremy White, chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, Dr. Henry More, Arch-Bishop Tillotson, Dr. Thomas Burnet, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Dr. Samuel C. Clark, Dr. George Cheeney, Chevalier Ramsay, Daniel De Foe—the celebrated author, Dr. Doddridge, Dr. Edward Young—author of "Night Thoughts," the sainted Oberlin, Dr. Tholuck, Rev. John Foster—the most eminent Baptist minister of his age, Gen. Green, Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, and the eminent Dr. Redman; and, of the Orthodox clergy in the days of our Revolution, were Dr. Charles Chauncey, of Boston, Dr. John Tyler, of Norwich, Conn., Dr. Joseph Huntington, of Coventry, Conn.; the renowned and eminent Dr. Dick died a Universalist; and, of the other professions, there were Dr. Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, Edward Everett, George Bancroft and Prescott—the historians, Alfred Tennyson—the poet, Southey, S. T. Coleridge, Wm. and Mary Howitt, Philip James Bailey, Augustus Neander—the great Biblical writer, and scholar. And there is pretty

good evidence that Dr. Watts, author of Watts' Psalms and Hymns, was a believer in Universal Redemption.

With the names of such men and a simple definition of their work, I could compile a large volume. And they are men who could not discover any evidence to prove *endless misery*,—which Miss. Prouty declares "is presented in every possible form of language, and so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

The foregoing names make quite a list, in which are the names of some of the wisest, best and most eminent in scholarship and piety : and according to Miss Prouty's *satirical* use of the Scripture text, they are *fools*.

Reader! What think you of the list! Do you belong to it?

THE WILL OF GOD.

You affirm on page 65, and in 4th and 5th paragraphs, that all which is necessary to convince you that Universalism is true, is to show it in the Bible. This I have done emphatically and plainly and from the Bible; but you chafe under it like a caged tiger, lashed with hunger. But you still add, "The Bible is your guide, and God's revealed *will* you confidently accepted."

Because of this statement, I purpose now to examine briefly the Will of God.

I remark first then, that the Bible does not, in any place, speak of God *willing* the endless loss, punishment, or misery, of *any soul*. There is no revelation of any such *will* concerning the consequences of sin. And yet, you say "that, being satisfied that in the Bible you found his revealed *will*, and you accepted it confidently." And the *will* of God makes no revelation about your all-important subject, "*endless misery*," which you have so heartily accepted, and tried to maintain. But his revealed will for the salvation of *all men*, you most radically reject.

I ask you to consider that Will, for a few moments.

In 1 Tim. II: 1 to 8, is the transporting fact, "that God *wills* the salvation of all men;" and then he directs all of every denom-

ination, to pray for that will. Thus, the result—the ultimate redemption, is inevitable. Hence, says John (1 John v : 14, 15) “This is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his *will*, he heareth us. And we have the petition desired of him. These words are direct on the subject, and make the issue *certain*.”

Now, that God *wills* the salvation of *all*, is not doubted by any sane person acquainted with the Bible; and no one will dispute the fact, that *all Christians*, from the Apostles to the present hour, have *prayed* for that *will*.

And Inspiration affirms, that “their prayer shall be heard, and their desire granted.” Thus, John says, “this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask anything *according* to his *will*, he heareth us, and we know that we have the petitions we desired of him.”

The Will of God, in prayer, then, claims and affirms final redemption. And the Bible asserts that the Will of God is the only power that can regenerate and sanctify men. Hence we read, (Jno. 1 : 13,) “Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God.” Here, the only admitted power is the *will* of God.”

Again. James 1 : 18, “Of his own Will, begat he us, that we should be a kind of first fruits.” On which *will*, Paul says (Heb. x : 9, 10,) “Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. By which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.”

These words teach the eventual sanctification of *all*, for whom Christ was offered.

And that we are to be delivered from *all evil*, by the Will of God, Paul to the Galatians affirms, (1 : 4,) “Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this *present* evil world,” (not from future endless misery,) “according to the will of God, and our Father.” Thus we are to ask devoutly in *prayer*, for “the coming of God’s *will* in the earth as it is in heaven,” that it may redeem, regenerate, and sanctify all souls.

But you, or the Orthodox ministers combined with you to meet me, may declare that this large amount of testimony is only about a will of *desire*, and not of *purpose*, on the part of God.

But the Scriptures answer you all very plainly. St. Paul says, Eph. 1: 4, 5, "According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will."

You may claim that these words only apply to the elect. But read on—as the Scriptures absorb with great ease, every objection to the final result. Hence the words (Eph. 1: 7, 8, 9) "To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved: In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; Having made known unto us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself."

Here, all must admit, that his will is a will of *predestination*, *purpose* and *determination*. Eph. 1: 10, "That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him."

Notice! it embraces *all* things in heaven and in earth, and they are to be gathered in Christ, and of course "made new creatures." And here follows the great assurance, viz. Eph. 1: 11, "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will."

Now if "God will have all men to be saved, and worketh all things after the counsel of his own *will*, and Christ came to do that Will," how is it possible for *final redemption* to fail? And as Christ said, with the light of eternity upon his spirit, "*thy will* be done in earth as it is in heaven," and commanded all to "pray after this manner," where is the possible chance of failure?

With the sincerity of eternal consequences, I ask, how is it possible, with these *infinite evidences*, for ultimate salvation to fail? And what possible *chance* is there to doubt the great *redemption*, when there is not even an *inference* of failure presented in the Bible?

Oh ! why not be consistent in faith and practice ; why not admit the whole truth of God's word, and let its fullness search your soul with harmony and beauty, with truth and righteousness, that all may be convinced of your regeneration, and that *with you* religion be made a *living fact*. Ah ! to have your prayer according to the will of God, and your faith according to your *prayer*, and then have your whole life *within and without* in keeping with your faith, Oh ! it will be a mighty power to aid in redeeming lost man.

And thus to conform to the will of God will build for you an imperishable monument for Christ's sake, amid the hearts of humanity, which will make your life a blessed missionary on earth ages after you have gone where man shall no more hunger nor thirst.

SYNOPSIS OF THIS SUBJECT.

- (1.) God wills the salvation of all men.
- (2.) God worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.
- (3.) All will be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, 1 Tim. ii: 1 to 8. The conclusion is emphatic and irresistible. Will "you abide by it and confidently accept its teachings," as you pledged to do, on page 62?

Finally. If you are not satisfied, will you mention the word or words on which you can rely to support the soul-crushing doctrine of *endless misery* ?

Is it on the word *sin*?—This is to be "taken away," Jno. i: 29 ; "to be ended," Dan: ix: 24.

Is it on the word *transgression*?—This is to be "finished," Dan. ix: 24.

Is it in the word *wickedness*?—This is to come to "an end," Ps. vii; 9.

Is it on the word *everlasting, forever or eternal*? These and their Greek origin, "*aionion*," are ambiguous words, with limited meaning.

Is it on the phrase *unpardonable sin*? This is not in the Bible.

Is it on the phrase "*unquenchable fire*?" This was material, and wherever it was kindled, has gone out centuries ago.

Is it on the word *punishment* or *vengeance*? These are *synonymous*, meaning *correction* and *reformation*, for the Bible declares an *afterwards* to chastisement.

Is it on the word *hell*? This is to be "destroyed," Hosea xiii 14. In this text the word rendered *death* is "*hades*," which is rendered "*hell*" in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus."

Is it on the word *endless*? This is not connected with sin, death, punishment, vengeance, nor hell, in the entire Scriptures.

Is it on the word *death*? This is to be "destroyed" (1 Cor. xv : 26); "to be swallowed up in victory" (verse 55); Jesus is to "abolish it" (2 Tim i : 10); "And there shall be no more death," Rev. xxi : 4.

Oh ! what *infinite* absorptions are there here of all evil, by the powers of the great Redemption ! A belief and character in them, is the *only religion* which can answer life's great prayer.

Hence, Universalism means a devoted and prayerful character, not to be seen of men, but to be accepted of God. Through Christ, it is the greatest of all subjects. To be a *Universalist*, is the most important work to be done this side of the world to come.

Universalism is the loving of God "with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind : and thy neighbor as thyself." It is the "doing unto others as you would that they do to you."

And, to show you its moral and spiritual influence and power on the race, for good, for redemption, and for peace with God through Christ, I will ask you to look over the following statistics of crime, in this country and in Europe, that you may see how many criminals are Universalists.

If the doctrine of Universalism is pernicious in its spirit and teachings, it will inevitably appear in the life and conduct of those who profess it.

Let us go to the receptacles of sin and crime, and with the foregoing criterion, *test* both Orthodoxy and Universalism.

STATE PRISONS AND OTHER STATISTICS.

The records of the "Rosine Association" of Philadelphia, for the reform of abandoned females, were examined a few years ago, and out of several hundred cases only *one designated* herself as a *Universalist*, and she, on being questioned by the matron, proved to be very ignorant concerning the doctrine. *All the rest* were Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians—believers in endless misery.

(2.) An official report of the prison in Toronto, C. W., gives the *religions* of its criminals in 1856, as follows, viz. 917 Roman Catholics, 765 Episcopalians, 152 Presbyterians, 64 Methodists, 3 Baptists, 3 Nothingarians,—*not one Universalist* in the entire number—1910.

It must be remembered that the name *Presbyterian*, in all places, is the same as Orthodox Congregational in New England, with a slight variation in the form of Church government.

(3.) The 27th annual Report of the Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania (March, 1856) thus classified the convicts, viz. 110 Methodists, 90 Roman Catholics, 65 German Lutherans, 50 Presbyterian or Congregationalists, 21 Episcopalians, 14 German Reformed, 12 Baptists, 6 Friends, 4 Christians; 2 of each of the following—Disciples, French Protestants, Dutch Reformed, and United Brethren; and *one* each of Mennonists, Ranters and Israelites; and *one Universalist*.

(4.) The State Prisons of New York have been examined at various times, to ascertain the religious opinions and conditions of the convicts, and out of some 1200 to 1600, at each examination, *not one Universalist* was found among them.

"We have known *one* lay Universalist sent to the prison at Auburn. And *one* who has been a clergyman among us, I was informed, had been imprisoned there. And these cases appeared during two residences of 20 years" (says a clergyman) "in that State, in which I was extensively acquainted with the denomination in Central and Western New York."

Some years ago, Rev. J. M. Austin (then the settled Universalist minister of Auburn, N. Y.) was informed that a Methodist clergyman had asserted that there were, *then*, five Universalist

clergymen in that prison. With letter in hand, Rev. Mr. Austin called on Rev. Mr. Morrill, (the Orthodox Chaplain,) when the following dialogue took place, viz.:

Mr. Morrill, I hold a letter stating that there are *five* Universalist ministers confined here. Are there *five* of that class in your walls? "No, sir." Are there *three*? Mr. Morrill says, "No." Is there *one*? Mr. Morrill says, "there is not." Mr. Austin asked, Do you know of *one prisoner* who professes Universalism? Rev. Mr. Morrill replied, "I have found none." Mr. Austin then asked Are there any Methodists here? "Yes," said Rev. Mr. Morrill. Are there any Methodist clergymen? said Rev. Mr. Austin. "Yes, several," said Mr. Morrill. Mr. Austin then inquired, How many? Hesitating, as if counting, Mr. Morrill said, "There are *five* here now, I believe."

(5.) The State Prison in Michigan has been examined several times for the same object. While *nearly* all, if not *all* the prisoners were found to be sound believers in the doctrine of endless sin and woe—not *one Universalist* was at any time to be found among them.

Again. An examination of the Prisons in Europe, has disclosed nearly the same facts.

Again. In all instances on record, (save one, in the case of Rev. Charles Spear, asked by the N. Y. jailor to attend a criminal who had no religious belief whatever,) Universalist ministers have never been requested to serve a criminal at the scaffold; but the service has been given by believers in endless punishment.

Again. Not an instance in all the cases of martyrdom, can be shown as caused by a Universalist.

Facts are *stubborn things*, in any case. But such an array of *facts*, on the moral tendency of Universalism and Orthodoxy, are overwhelming, against the *heathen doctrine of endless misery*, and in favor of Universalism.

QUESTIONS, WITH ANSWERS FROM HISTORY.

Who carried on the persecutions in Holland, where *one* hundred thousand died by the hand of the executioner? Believers in endless misery.

Who burned heretics to death? Believers in endless misery.

Who were the persecutors—in France, England, Ireland, Spain, Italy and Scotland,—even to death, of many, many thousands? Believers in endless misery.

Who was the cause of burning Servetus at the stake? *John Calvin*—the father of modern Orthodoxy.

Who originated the crusade against Jerusalem, butchered 60,000 in one day, and wasted an army of 600,000 in the so-called Holy War? A believer in endless misery.

Who kindled the fires of Smithfield? Who reared the Spanish Inquisition? The believers in endless misery.

Who butchered 40,000 at the St. Bartholomew massacre? Believers in endless misery.

Mahomet, with his legions, who fought with terrible vengeance, put hundreds of thousands to death in all possible forms of barbarism. He was a believer in endless misery.

The Parliament of England in 1620, enacted a law to punish Universalists with imprisonment: and if they did not recant, put them to death.

The members of that Parliament believed in endless misery.

Who hung thousands for supposed witchcraft? Believers in endless misery.

Who banished Roger Williams and publicly whipped women for heresy? Believers in endless misery.

Who cut off both ears, and burned the tongue through with a red hot iron for being Quakers? Believers in endless misery.

Said Tertullian (who revived the Pagan notion of endless woe in the Christian Church,) "How I shall laugh, how exult when I behold myriads of mankind groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness." Was not this the utterance of a fiendish spirit?

Said President Edwards, of Princeton College, "The sight of hell-torments will exalt the happiness of the saints forever. It will give them a more lively relish for it, when they shall see the raging of their flames, and hear their dolorous shrieks and cries, O! how the saints will rejoice." How unlike the Saviour, who wept at the grave of Lazarus.

Dr. Emmons said, in a published sermon, "The saints will sing sweet hallelujahs in view of the lost."

Rev. Mr. Spaulding (an Orthodox) says, "The saints will look over the battlements of heaven upon their friends in suffering, unmoved."

Who persecuted thousands, and murdered many hundreds, and drove many, *many* Pilgrims to America? The believers in endless misery.

Who persecuted, stoned and killed the Prophets? Believers in endless misery.

Who unlawfully arrested, tried, condemned and murdered the only Son of God, our Saviour? Believers in endless misery.

Such in brief is a very, *very small* amount of testimony from history, against the moral tendency of Orthodoxy, or a belief in *endless misery*.

Such is some of the testimony against the awful doctrine for which you have bartered honor, respectability, justice and truth, to defend with assumption, arrogance and sarcasm. Such is the moral influence of the dogma of *endless misery* for which you have broken the laws of humanity, and of your country, with the special and willful purpose of defaming a minister of Universalism. Such are some of the soul-debasing effects of the heathen creed of *endless*

misery, for which you have not hesitated to misrepresent and falsify me and yourself, the Discussion and Scripture, the Apostles and our Saviour, in attempting its support.

The evidence proves your religion opposed to nature, reason and revelation; that it dishonors God, Christ, and humanity, and represents God to be worse than the most guilty and abandoned.

Look at it solemnly for a moment, if you can! Strip the creed of *endless misery* of all its disguises! Make it a fact, that a single human soul is made immortal for suffering, "kept in being that it may be endlessly tormented; compelled to remain in sin, shut out from all possibility of repentance and deliverance, and it is too absolutely horrible for belief—for thorough, intelligent belief—without drifting the soul to the very verge of insanity, unless the heart" is utterly dead.

And if *endless misery* be a fact, it is from God, and under the government of *One*, who has all resources of wisdom, power and spiritual influences to prevent it. Now, who could love and adore such a Being, however much he commands the worship? Would not the command fill the heart with horror and loathing?

You cannot love such a God, and it is impossible to worship Him in spirit and in truth, or pray to Him or praise Him. All within us revolts at such a thought. "Reason, reverence, affection—all shrink away from Him with undisguised terror and disgust." Christian faith then fills the soul with perpetual unrest about our loved ones, and the agony of despair broods over us like a pall of doom.

But in opposition to all this system, and with vastly different influence, is the religion of *final redemption*; which was preached by God to Adam and Eve in the Garden, and "preached by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," Acts III: 21, and preached especially by the Apostles, by the direction of Christ, "who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

This system is the religion of faith, hope, and charity; of benevolence and love. It is the religion of dealing justly, loving

mercy, walking humbly, and of doing unto others as we would that they do to us. It is the religion which bears away our ignorance, error and sin, and overcomes all evil by infinite love and goodness.

It is the religion of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—"of good tidings of great joy which shall be unto all people."

It is a religion which, like its author, is infinite in redemption,—pursuing the prodigal to his return, seeking the lost till found and restored,—and is a kingdom in every person's heart, of whose increase there is no end.

It is a religion which opens to all men the means of grace, opens to them a world of reconciliation, peace and reunion, and bestows upon all (in the full dispensation) that life *incorruptible*, "where death is swallowed up in victory," and where there "shall be no death."

Oh! what religion can so purify, elevate and dignify, as that of final redemption, and endless life? How it exalts man above every thing sinful and degrading and gives him an angel's thoughts and associations. Destined to heaven, he turns away from every thing opposed to its spirit, its glory, its songs of praise, its crowns of rejoicing.

And when his enraptured soul thinks of the immensity of its prospect—the glory, honor and immortality which awaits it,—emotions which the spirits of the just feel, lift it up into holy communion with God.

O blessed doctrine this! Mightier, far mightier than all the powers of earth; and dearer, infinitely dearer than all its treasures.

That the powers of this blessed Gospel may (in due time) fully pervade your whole being, and cause your remaining existence to be one of piety and devotion, shall ever be my prayer.

Most truly yours in the hope of Redemption,

E. S. FOSTER.





Acme

Bookbinding Co., Inc.
300 Summer Street
Boston, Mass. 02210

BT836.P76

The correspondence and discussion o
Andover-Harvard 000822508



3 2044 077 891 000

the 1990s, the number of people in the UK who are employed in the public sector has increased by 1.5 million, from 2.5 million in 1980 to 4 million in 1995 (Department of Health 1996).

There is a growing emphasis on the need to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.

The Health Care Act 1999 also aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population. This has led to a number of initiatives, including the introduction of the Health Care Act 1999, which aims to improve the quality of care in the public sector, and to ensure that the public sector is able to meet the needs of the population.